

UNIFORM CRIME REPORTS

FOR THE UNITED STATES

SPECIAL ISSUE, 1958

*Issued by the
Federal Bureau of Investigation
United States Department of Justice
Washington, D. C.*



ADVISORY

**Committee on Uniform Crime Records
International Association of Chiefs of Police**

**STANLEY R. SCHROTEL, Chief of Police
Cincinnati, Ohio, Chairman**

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1958

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Summary of special issue, 1958	1-3
Report of Consultant Committee:	
Letter of transmittal	7-8
Introduction	9-13
Importance of Uniform Crime Reporting Program and the role of the Consultant Committee	9-11
Voluntary nature of cooperation in data collection	11-12
The broader function of the Uniform Crime Reports	12-13
Analysis of present practices and recommendations	14-44
Policies in making changes in the UCR's	14
Continuity of the statistical series	14
The objectives of the Uniform Crime Reporting Program	15-18
Collection and publication of data	18-20
Frequency of reports from cooperating police departments	18-19
Frequency of publication	19-20
Classification of offenses	20-28
Part I and part II offenses	20-25
Manslaughter by negligence	25-27
Petty larceny	27-28
Auto theft	28
General United States crime statistics	29-41
Rural versus urban criminality	29-31
Crime rates	31-33
Estimating the totals	33-37
The trends	37-38
Present data gathering versus sampling	39-40
Miscellaneous offenses	40-41
Juvenile offenders	41-43
Various editorial matters	43-44
A Permanent Technical Consultant Committee	45-46
Appendix I. Proposed agenda for the Committee	47-49
Appendix II. Exploratory tabulations using Standard Metropolitan Areas	51-62
Appendix III. List of actions taken by the Committee	63-70
Data for 1957 from police reports	71-74
Offenses cleared and persons arrested, 1957:	
Offenses cleared by arrest (tables 1, 2).	72-73
Offenses known, offenses cleared, persons charged and persons found guilty (table 3)	74
Persons charged and persons found guilty (table 4)	74

UNIFORM CRIME REPORTS

J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, U. S. Department of Justice, Washington, D. C.

Special Issue

November 1958

Summary

Discontinuance of Semiannual Publication

Uniform Crime Reports, published semiannually since 1941, will be published only once each year in the future. This action follows the recommendation of a Consultant Committee and will bring together in one annual publication all crime data for the calendar year. The 1958 Uniform Crime Reports will be published in the fall of 1959.

Purpose of 1958 Special Issue of Uniform Crime Reports

The special issue of Uniform Crime Reports presented here has as its primary purpose the publication of the report and related papers of the Consultant Committee on Uniform Crime Reporting and also to present, for continuity purpose, 1957 crime data which was not included in the 1957 annual issue of Uniform Crime Reports.

Consultant Committee on Uniform Crime Reporting

Late in 1957 the FBI employed a Consultant Committee on Uniform Crime Reporting to make an independent analysis of the Uniform Crime Reporting program. The survey was made by Dr. Peter P. Lejins, Department of Sociology, University of Maryland, Chairman; Dr. Charlton F. Chute, Director of the Institute of Public Administration, New York City; and Mr. Stanley R. Schrotel, Chief of Police at Cincinnati, Ohio.

Copies of the report of the Consultant Committee were furnished to members of the Committee on Uniform Crime Records of the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) for their individual reactions prior to publication of it here. While general endorsement of the report was given by the IACP group, some concern was expressed as to whether the police would, under the recommendations, have available in the future the basic information that they have had in the past and whether that information would be available on a relatively current basis.

Since these questions may arise in the minds of other users of the data, it is suggested that the answer to them will be found in the degree the FBI finds it possible to implement the principles set forth in the report, particularly as to recommendation 2 (p. 14) and recommendation 7 (p. 20).

Recommendation 2 suggests that in any changes of format in the publication of Uniform Crime Reports the FBI make every reasonable effort to maintain continuity with reference to the crime statistics that have been published in the past. In recommendation 7 the Consultant Committee, while suggesting that only one annual bulletin be issued, pointed out that "issuance of intermediate publications of limited scope, which the FBI might find appropriate for release, is of course not precluded by this recommendation but is actually encouraged."

For the information of the police and other users of the Uniform Crime Reports, the FBI is in accord with all of the recommendations of the Consultant Committee. With particular reference to the two recommendations referred to above, it is the present plan to issue quarterly releases in the nature of preliminary data showing crime trends for the most recent available period for cities by population group and also the number of offenses reported by individual cities with population in excess of 100,000. For example, according to present plans, in April or May of 1959 such a release of preliminary data covering the 1958 calendar year would be published with the expressed understanding that the data are subject to minor adjustments on the basis of additional reports and correspondence with contributing agencies. Approximately 3 months later, preliminary figures covering the first quarter of the calendar year 1959 would be released and so on throughout the year.

In the early fall of 1959 a complete annual Uniform Crime Reports covering all available statistics compiled under Uniform Crime Reporting in considerable detail would be available for distribution.

In the new annual Uniform Crime Reports a more convenient treatment of police statistics will be available in one volume for the general reader plus more meaningful presentations which will assist police and others interested in the crime problem.

An index to crime will be continued but emphasis is to be shifted somewhat from the original Part I crimes which were designed over a quarter of a century ago by the International Association of Chiefs of Police to serve such a purpose and which have been so used in Uniform Crime Reports. Classifications retained for crime index purposes are: Murder and nonnegligent manslaughter; forcible rape; robbery; aggravated assault; burglary; larceny, \$50 and over; and auto theft.

Now that most of the population is concentrated in and around cities with a resultant loss of true rural areas in many instances, the retention of the distinction in crime tables separated only as to cities and rural has become inadequate as a means of contrasting differences in crime experience between two areas formerly dissimilar in character. Crime reporting jurisdictions do not automatically shift with the population and today many sheriffs who report for areas in their county which are outside the limits of cities are in effect reporting the equivalent of city crime insofar as volume is concerned.

Because of the impossibility of separating from a sheriff's crime report that portion of crime which covers areas urban in character but which are not cities, and because it would be entirely too burdensome to the reporting law enforcement agencies to maintain several sets of statistical figures for reporting purposes, a basis of publication other than city (urban) and rural was recommended, the Standard Metropolitan Area.

A presentation of crime data for the three areas will be shown: (1) Standard Metropolitan Areas; (2) Other Cities; (3) Rural. A Standard Metropolitan Area, as defined by the Bureau of the Census, generally is a county which contains at least 1 city of 50,000 inhabitants plus any contiguous counties essentially metropolitan in character and sufficiently integrated with the central city. Reporting jurisdictions for crime-reporting purposes coincide with the boundaries of areas included in a Standard Metropolitan Area. Outside these population centers are other cities and the rural areas. Tabulations will not be limited to the three areas enumerated above but the use of the Standard Metropolitan Area data will permit the presentation of crime rates based on population estimates in the between-census years which can be made available by the Bureau of the Census. A limited exploratory tabulation illustrating in a general way the steps involved in the procedure to be followed for the above three areas is presented in Appendix II of the Report, page 51. It will be observed from the indicated tabulation that one product of the proposed procedure will be an estimate of total known crime in the United States for selected categories with the detailed steps used in arriving at the estimates shown clearly.

Data for 1957 From Police Reports

Offenses Cleared and Persons Arrested, 1957. Available data on offenses cleared, persons charged, and persons found guilty, compiled before receipt of the Consultant Committee report, are included in this special issue to round out the 1957 data included in the annual issue for 1957 Uniform Crime Reports, page 71.

DR.

DR

MR

UNIFORM CRIME REPORTING

Report of the Consultant Committee

September 1958

DR. PETER P. LEJINS, *Department of Sociology, University of Maryland*
(Chairman)

DR. CHARLTON F. CHUTE, *Director, Institute of Public Administration,*
New York City

MR. STANLEY R. SCHROTEL, *Chief of Police, Cincinnati, Ohio*

Mr

of
rep
con
con
sta
Re

ab
co
TI
D
di
na
C
co
th

R
ta
co
at
ti
m
un
in
m
w

in
R
sh
b
e
c

Letter of Transmittal

SEPTEMBER 29, 1958.

Mr. J. EDGAR HOOVER,

Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation,

United States Department of Justice, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOOVER: Herewith I am transmitting to you the report of the Consultant Committee on Uniform Crime Reporting. The report is self-explanatory and as such needs no further introduction or commentary. Dr. Charlton F. Chute and Chief Stanley R. Schrotel concur with me, however, in the wish to take this opportunity and to state the general position of this Committee on the Uniform Crime Reporting Program and its own role with reference to it.

The Committee considers the Uniform Crime Reports unquestionably the most important source of information on crime in this country on a national scale, of use to both practitioner and scholar. Their publication is an outstanding accomplishment. For this the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the personnel directly responsible for the production of the Reports, the International Association of Chiefs of Police and its Committee on Uniform Crime Reporting, and the cooperating police departments deserve a compliment of the highest order from those who are concerned with the problem of crime in the United States.

Perhaps the most outstanding feature of the Uniform Crime Reporting Program is the fact that for all of the information contained in the Reports the Bureau has to depend on the voluntary cooperation of the police throughout the country. Many other attempts by other agencies to secure continuous nationwide cooperation in similar enterprises have failed. The Bureau's accomplishment in securing in many respects well-nigh universal coverage is unique. It reflects a delicate balance in the exercise of vigor and tact in the Bureau's relations with the participating police agencies, and must be attributed, of course, to the tremendous overall prestige which the Bureau enjoys in this country.

The Committee sees itself as an instrument developed by the FBI in the latter's continuous effort to improve the Uniform Crime Reporting Program. The Committee's suggestions for changes should by no means be interpreted as criticism of the program as such, but rather as recognition of the need for continuous adjustment which every program of this nature requires. With constant changes in the crime picture, with changes in the patterns of law enforcement, with

(7)

the gradual progress in the science and techniques of gathering and presenting statistical information, the need for adaptation of the program through periodic revision is to be expected.

In reading this report it should be kept in mind that although the Committee was invited to review the Uniform Crime Reports in their entirety, it was charged at the outset with the task of considering certain specific issues which were of primary concern to the staff engaged in the production of the Reports. There were limits to the time available to the Committee, which in turn restricted the scope of the project. By pointing this out, the Committee is not attempting to dodge responsibility for the content of its report, but rather wishes it to be very clear that the issues discussed therein are only selected issues which appeared to be particularly important, and that there may be other points which could appropriately be raised.

The Committee is particularly pleased to acknowledge the wonderful cooperation it received from the staff of the Bureau. It felt all along that the staff took the Committee fully into its confidence and made a real effort to supply all necessary information and answer all questions.

Through its recommendations the Committee hopes to contribute in some measure to the even greater usefulness of the Uniform Crime Reporting Program and is sure that this Program will continue as the most important segment of the nationwide criminal statistics published in the United States.

Sincerely yours,

(S) Peter P. Lejins,
PETER P. LEJINS,
Chairman,

Consultant Committee on Uniform Crime Reporting.

Introduction

Importance of Uniform Crime Reporting Program and the Role of the Consultant Committee

When appointing the Consultant Committee on Uniform Crime Reporting, the Federal Bureau of Investigation drew up a proposed agenda for the study to be undertaken.¹ This agenda was predicated upon recognition of the fact that the time had come to review the Uniform Crime Reporting Program, in existence since 1930, "for the purpose of making suggestions." The task was delineated as a very general one, to wit, "these suggestions may cover any phase of the collection or publication of the data that comes to mind in the light of the experience gained thus far."

More specifically, however, three issues were tentatively singled out for study, indicating to the Committee the current areas of primary concern to the personnel in charge of the publication. These were: 1. The population basis for the computation of the rates, especially in view of the rapid population changes occurring between the decennial United States censuses; 2. the question of reporting criminal offenses for the rural population, which arises in view of the fact that many rural areas, especially those in the vicinity of the large metropolitan centers have actually become urban in character, although retaining their rural police jurisdiction; and 3. the makeup of the group of offenses labeled "Part I offenses," especially with reference to the inclusion of manslaughter by negligence and larceny, and above all petty larceny.

The suggestion of these specific issues served to channel the Committee's work accordingly. But in order to see these issues in the overall perspective, the Committee had to resort to a broader review of the program and thus approached the more general assignment suggested in the tentative agenda.

The proposed agenda suggested, moreover, that the Committee keep in mind in its recommendations both the criminal statistics standpoint and the police standpoint.

It should be pointed out that the Committee had definite time and personnel limitations, and its study and this report should therefore not be interpreted as an all-inclusive or exhaustive analysis of the Uniform Crime Reporting Program.

The Consultant Committee approached its task with full realization of the great importance of the Uniform Crime Reporting Program of the FBI for police work, law enforcement, and crime control in general,

¹ See Appendix I.

as well as for research and the scientific interpretation of the crime situation. The Committee was fully aware of the fact that the Uniform Crime Reports are the only general crime statistics on a nationwide scale available at the present time in the United States. Other criminal statistics are only partial, that is, they deal only with some particular category of offenses, or have very limited coverage.

By way of an example, one might mention the Juvenile Court Statistics published by the Children's Bureau. In addition to being limited to juvenile delinquency, these statistics were admittedly "incomplete both in items reported and geographical representation."¹ The new method introduced beginning with the 1956 data resorts to a sampling procedure, rather than attempting to collect the information for all the courts.² The National Safety Council statistics on traffic deaths, which constitute the greater part of manslaughter by negligence, present a similar problem. While these may be good statistics, they deal, of course, with only one particular offense. Similarly, one might mention the arson or embezzlement statistics which are attempted on a national scale by organizations in the respective areas. In addition to again being only partial statistics, they are also very incomplete. The National Prisoner Statistics, collected and published at the present time by the Federal Bureau of Prisons, are still another example. While these are excellent statistics, they do not deal directly with the overall crime situation but rather with one single aspect of it, that is, with the institutionalized offenders. In that sense they reflect the policy and the facilities in the area of imprisonment rather than the crime situation in the country.

The so-called Judicial Criminal Statistics, collected and published by the Bureau of the Census once upon a time, may well serve as an example of statistics which had to be discontinued because of obstacles which the Uniform Crime Reporting Program managed to overcome. They represented an ambitious undertaking of having statistics of crime based on the offenses established by the courts. This statistical series never secured the continuous cooperation of a sufficient number of courts and was discontinued at the recommendation of a special committee, called together by the Bureau of the Budget, since the statistics seemed totally useless in the form in which they appeared.

The Committee was aware of the generally accepted theoretical position that at least for the United States, in view of the structure of law enforcement in this country, crimes known to the police represent the best statistics for the purpose of a crime index both as to total volume, the volume of separate offenses, and in general.

The Committee therefore approached its task with recognition of

¹ I. Richard Perlman. "Reporting Juvenile Delinquency," *NPPA Journal*, July 1957, p. 245.

² *Juvenile Court Statistics*. 1956, Children's Bureau Statistical Series No. 47, 1958, Washington, D. C., p. 1.

the importance of the Uniform Crime Reporting Program, recognition of the tremendous work done by the Federal Bureau of Investigation in carrying out this program, and awareness of the fact that this program should by all means be continued and encouraged. The Committee's suggestions for some changes should therefore not be interpreted as criticism of the program as such; they are meant to be constructive suggestions for further improvement. The Committee sees itself as an instrument developed by the FBI in the latter's continued efforts to improve its Uniform Crime Reporting Program. With the constant changes taking place in the crime picture, with changes in the patterns of law enforcement, with the gradual progress being made in the science and techniques of gathering and presenting statistical information, the need for adaptation of all programs of this type through periodic revision is to be expected. The recommendations of this Committee and the work on which these recommendations are based should be looked upon as an instance of such continuous program review.

Voluntary Nature of Cooperation in Data Collection

In approaching the FBI Uniform Crime Reports, it should be kept in mind that the relationship between the FBI and the police departments which supply the FBI with the statistical data on which the reports are based is one of voluntary cooperation. The FBI does not have any legal authority over the local police departments where-by it could require the statistical information and prescribe the way and the form in which it should be supplied. This fact is very often overlooked, especially by those who compare the Uniform Crime Reports with police statistics coming from abroad, where the relationship between the police authority of the central political government and the local police departments is frequently one of subordination and where the local police force is simply a branch or part of the central authority, so that the latter can issue directives which must be followed.

It is in the nature of American government that most matters of law enforcement are in the hands of the States, counties, municipalities, etc. The local police is not in any way obligated to fulfill the requests or follow the directions of the Federal agency, but the relationship depends entirely upon voluntary cooperation at all levels. This type of relationship, of course, in many ways affects the process of collecting the information needed for the Uniform Crime Reports.

First, the information is only as complete and accurate as the local police authorities are willing to make it. If the local authorities choose not to report at all, to report irregularly, or to report incompletely, nothing can be done about this in the sense of ordering them

to do things the way they should be done. In addition, the type of cooperation received by the FBI in this area cannot be interpreted exclusively as a demonstration of the effectiveness of the FBI in securing the information from the police authorities. The amount of cooperation by the police authorities expresses not only their cooperativeness or lack thereof with the FBI, but the general climate of relations between local government and the Federal Government in any area. It is true that the FBI can, to a certain extent, improve this cooperative relationship, but the latter will always reflect the general pattern of cooperation with the Federal Government as a whole.

Secondly, another way in which the factor of voluntary cooperation makes itself felt is in the manner in which the information has to be collected. Since cooperation is voluntary, the collecting agency has to be very careful about its public relations. This undoubtedly affects the type and the form of data that may be requested. The FBI has to be constantly aware of how much information it can ask in order not to endanger cooperation. It also has to be aware of how much pressure it can exercise in case of noncompliance, how soon reminders and how many reminders can be made, etc. This also plays an important role with regard to the nature of the data requested. The FBI has to be constantly watchful so as not to lose the cooperation of the local police agencies by asking information which would require too much work or be so complicated in form as possibly to discourage the local authorities from supplying it.

The Broader Function of the Uniform Crime Reports

Another important consideration with regard to the Uniform Crime Reports arises in the following connection. These reports are statistics which the FBI collects for the promotion of better law enforcement as a result of a request made by the International Association of Chiefs of Police. Moreover, these statistics are collected by the FBI, as previously stated, with the voluntary cooperation of the police agencies; they are collected for the use of the police and therefore it is quite natural that they must include first of all information that is of interest to the police. Especially since, as was pointed out above, the cooperation of police agencies is involved, it is difficult to be guided by any purposes other than the direct interest of the police in the matter. The statistics presumably have to have some significance for police work.

On the other hand, it should be kept in mind that in spite of the fact that the Uniform Crime Reports represent statistical information of importance to the police, they are regularly released also to other interested agencies and individuals, as well as to the press, in other

words, to the general public. Thus they are accessible to the entire citizenry of the United States. In that sense they have become the major source of information for the United States in matters of crime. The release of the reports is eagerly awaited by the press and receives front-page attention all over the country. Editorial commentary follows in many papers and additional articles in the way of comment and analysis very often appear. Researchers, welfare agencies, both public and private, various governmental agencies, local, State and Federal—all make ever-increasing use of the reports. This fact imposes an added responsibility on the FBI. It cannot simply maintain that what it publishes about crime is for the use of the police only and therefore the needs of the FBI and other police departments should alone determine the content of the releases. In view of the fact that the Uniform Crime Reports have come to play the kind of role they do in this country, the responsibility of informing the public in such a way that the information cannot lead to misunderstandings and misconceptions, but will be useful from the standpoint of crime control and law enforcement becomes self-evident.

Anyone familiar with the situation knows that in spite of the fact that there is much intelligent analysis by the press, there is also a regrettable amount of misinterpretation by some of the information contained in the Uniform Crime Reports each time they are released. This causes unnecessary concern on the part of local governmental agencies, private organizations, and the public, frequently about imaginary problems. The FBI's own files of newspaper clippings from all over the country contain ample evidence of this. The Committee has learned about the great concern of the FBI about such misinterpretations and the amount of effort it puts into the publishing of the reports to forestall these and again after each release to straighten out misunderstandings on the part of the users.

Even though this is an introductory statement dealing with the general perspective on Uniform Crime Reporting, it appears warranted to sum up the Committee's point of view in the following recommendation:

Recommendation (1): Since the UCR's have outgrown being of use primarily to the law enforcement agencies, especially the police, and have become a basic source of information on crime for the country as a whole, the FBI should be encouraged to give as much recognition to this fact as is compatible with its program and be guided in the compilation and publication of the criminal statistics by the need to present these in such a way that the information will be meaningful to the general public and interested agencies and organizations even outside the immediate field of law enforcement.

Analysis of Present Practices and Recommendations

Policies in Making Changes in the UCR's

Continuity of the Statistical Series

The Committee considers it very important that in making any changes in the Uniform Crime Reports as the result of the Committee's suggestions or at any other time, the utmost care should be taken to preserve the continuity of the present statistical series. This is, of course, a problem which pertains not only to the FBI's Uniform Crime Reports but to any statistics of significant duration. It grows out of the fact that, as time goes on, changes become necessary and improve the quality of the statistical compilation. If on the other hand, changes in the analytical categories lead to a loss of continuity, that is, comparisons can no longer be made after the change, this may mean a considerable loss to the value of the compilation. With the UCR's being published for 28 years, the opportunities which they offer for comparisons in crime statistics over this period of more than a quarter of a century are, of course, of prime importance.

If the format of the presentation or the statistical categories are changed, one should, wherever feasible, give both the old and the new versions. In some cases it might suffice to present the data in such a way that the reader who is especially interested in time series can himself reconstruct the series as it appeared before, by making the necessary calculations. This is especially important in those cases where the use of crime data for scientific purposes is anticipated.

Recommendation (2): In making changes in the UCR's, the utmost care should be taken not to destroy the continuity of the statistical series. Wherever feasible, both versions, i. e., the old and the new, should be given, or the data should be presented in such a way that the reader himself can make the calculations necessary to utilize the data earlier collected and published.

The Objectives of the Uniform Crime Reporting Program

Any analysis of the Uniform Crime Reports, even one limited to certain specific issues, is predicated on a clear understanding of the purposes of this publication. In a very general way the purpose was indicated in the "Introduction" to this report as the promotion of better law enforcement through the collection and dissemination of pertinent information about crime and its control. A number of more specific objectives can, of course, be discerned. A closer look at the content of the UCR's shows that, first of all, there are criminal statistics. On the one hand there is an attempt to collect information about all offenses committed in this country, obtaining this information from the police jurisdictions into which the country is subdivided. For certain offenses (Pt. I offenses) this information is collected as these offenses become known to the police. For other offenses (Pt. II offenses) this information is collected as the offenders involved are arrested. On the other hand, the crime situation is analyzed by using a specific group of offenses (Pt. I offenses) as an index of criminality to establish trends and to make the figures for individual communities more meaningful by computing crime rates. All this is done separately for the urban and the rural areas of the United States. While the Part I offenses are used in these analyses as a crime index, this is not, as will be pointed out further in the Report, their only meaning or function. In the case of cities, the Part I offenses are further traced with regard to being cleared by arrest or by establishment of the offender's guilt.

Generally speaking much less use is made of Part II than of Part I offenses. The Part II offenses become known only through the arrest statistics. Information about arrests is collected only from the urban police departments and is analyzed in terms of age, sex, and race of the arrested offenders, with some trend, analysis, and use of rates. This, as just stated, is also done for the Part I offenses which result in arrests. Similarly, statistics are published for persons charged with crime in the responding urban areas and for persons found guilty. In addition several other kinds of crime statistics are published, such as the monthly variations in Part I offenses, number of persons released after being arrested or cited for various violations, the value of property lost through offenses against property, the value of property recovered, etc.

Another major statistical series within the UCR's—one which does not involve criminal statistics—is the section on police employee data. It should be pointed out that the Committee was concerned with the criminal statistics only, and the police employee data section was not studied at all.

From this very brief and very general review of the current content of the Uniform Crime Reports it can be seen that a wide variety of data is being collected and published, and a complicated statistical compilation results. In a very general way two major objectives or purposes seem to permeate this material. One is the collection of crime data for all communities of the entire country, which would give the total "crime bill" of the United States. The other is the use of a group of specific offenses (Pt. I offenses) as an index of criminality and of law enforcement activities.

One of the basic tasks of the Committee was to take a stand on these two objectives of the Uniform Crime Reports.

The idea of an index of crime, based on statistics of certain offenses, is a well worked-out topic in American criminology. Its development was coincident in time with the development of Uniform Crime Reporting. Those who are familiar with the history of American criminology know that in this case the theory and the practice were developed in conjunction with one another, and the same people were involved in both. The conventional concept of an index of crime is based on six assumptions: (1) That the statistics on crimes known to the police mirror the true occurrence of crimes better than any other kind of criminal statistics, at least in the United States; (2) that not all crimes become known to the police with equal consistency and therefore, for the purposes of an index, those offenses should be selected which are relatively most frequently and most consistently reported to the police; (3) that serious offenses have to be selected, because on the one hand we are interested mostly in the more serious crimes, and on the other hand, the more serious offenses have the general tendency of being reported to the authorities more frequently and more consistently than the less serious ones; (4) that an important qualification for inclusion of an offense is the uniformity of its definition for the entire territory for which the index is constructed; (5) that the offenses to be included should be sufficiently frequent to be statistically significant; and (6) that a certain optimum number of offenses answering the above 5 qualifications be used; an index based on 8 offenses is more meaningful than one based on 2. At the same time, of course, an index is supposed to be a manageable instrument and a shortcut, compared to the country's total picture of criminality.

The Committee endorses the production and use of a crime index, for the purposes of which the Part I offenses have heretofore been used. The Committee feels that an index of crime has a definite function to perform, and that historically speaking this was envisaged by the International Association of Chiefs of Police in developing the Uniform Crime Reporting Program. This can be clearly seen from

the appropriate sections of *Uniform Crime Reporting*.¹ Throughout the 28 years of their existence, the UCR's have produced and used such an index. Further analysis of what offenses should be utilized to construct such an index of crime and what changes might be made in that connection in the composition of the Part I offenses will be further discussed in the section of the Report entitled "Classification of Offenses."

The Committee also endorses the collection of all pertinent information on crime for the entire country as another major objective of the UCR's. This also was envisaged by the original designers of the Uniform Crime Reporting Program, and the UCR's stand as testimony of the unrelenting effort of the FBI to collect as complete information as possible on criminality in this country.

The Committee makes the following recommendations:

Recommendation (3): The objectives for collecting and presenting the statistical information on criminal offenses should be clearly formulated and adhered to at all times. A brief restatement of these objectives should appear in each issue of the UCR's to forestall misinterpretation of the data.

Recommendation (4): In view of the officially stated purposes of the Uniform Crime Reporting Program and in view of the actual content of the UCR's, the objective of publishing statistics on criminal offenses should be interpreted as a twofold one, i. e.: (1) Compilation and publication of a meaningful index of crime for the United States (presently accomplished by the reporting of Pt. I offenses); and (2) compilation and publication of the total volume of criminal offenses committed in the United States, by categories, perhaps entitled General Crime Statistics for the United States. It is understood that both of these statistical series are to serve as the basis for the computation of appropriate rates and trends and for making comparisons.

As already stated, the issues involved in the production of an index of crime will be discussed and certain recommendations made in that connection in the section of the report entitled "Classification of Offenses." Here, however, certain rather obvious recommendations will be made in connection with the second objective of the criminal statistics.

Recommendation (5): In presenting the total crime picture for the United States, a tabulation including all offenses, perhaps with the exception of some minor ones, should be aimed at, which means that this tabulation should include not only offenses currently reported as Part I offenses but also those reported as Part II.

¹ *Uniform Crime Reporting*. Committee on Uniform Crime Records, International Association of Chiefs of Police, 1929: p. 22.

Recommendation (6): In order to make the implementation of recommendation (5) possible, the collection of offenses of Part II, that is, offenses known through arrest, should be intensified in order to achieve more complete coverage for the urban communities, and a program of collecting this information for the rural areas should be initiated. Various analyses, such as by age, sex, and race, which can presently be made only for a limited number of offenders could then be extended to the entire criminal population.

The Committee is aware of the fact that recommendations (5) and (6) involve long-range projects, but feels that as long as the UCR's are not restricted to an index of crime but also have as an objective the collection and publication of information on all offenses, complete coverage for the country as a whole is a logical and ultimate goal. Recommendation (6) is directed toward two major gaps in the completeness of coverage for offenses of Part II: The incompleteness of urban coverage and the total absence of rural reporting. The Committee also refers the reader to its recommendation under the subtitle "Present Data Collection *versus* Sampling."

Collection and Publication of Data

Frequency of Reports From Cooperating Police Departments

The Committee has very seriously considered the possibility of diminishing the frequency of submission of the statistical reports by the cooperating police departments. This would mean abandoning the present scheme of getting monthly reports and substituting perhaps a quarterly or semiannual report from the police instead. The Committee has, however, rejected the idea of any change in this direction, in spite of the fact that it appears reasonable to assume that a report submitted quarterly, for instance, would decrease the amount of work to be done by the local police departments as compared to a monthly report. This could then perhaps be used as an argument for requesting an increased amount of information in the less frequent reports. The Committee is, however, aware of the fact that the request for a monthly report from the local police authorities serves a valuable educational purpose. The police departments are alerted at frequent intervals as regards statistical accounting. There is the danger that with the pressure for monthly reports removed, the police departments might become somewhat less punctilious and instead of producing more data for the 3-months report, might actually become less precise and, not having gotten up a report for a longer period,

could conceivably have difficulty in getting data together for the 3-months report. Besides, reports on a quarterly basis, if received together with monthly breakdowns, would probably have to be cross-checked for accuracy in the FBI, in which case the amount of work—from the FBI point of view at least—would not diminish at all. Besides, of course, all analyses which are based on monthly reports, for instance the fluctuation of crime frequency in the course of the year, might suffer considerably, especially if some of the departments would fail to send in the monthly breakdowns and supply only the totals for the quarter or the half year.

After studying this matter—**Matters Discussed (I)**—the Committee decided not to recommend any change in the current practice.

Frequency of Publication

At the present time the UCR's are being published twice a year as a semiannual and an annual bulletin. There was a time when they were issued on a quarterly basis and, prior to that, monthly. The question was raised whether any change should be made in the present frequency of publication, and it was suggested that only one annual bulletin be put out.

First of all, it was felt that with the present staff and budget facilities, the publication of two volumes a year places considerable pressure on the FBI in the sense that the agency has to be constantly publication conscious; there are always deadlines to be met. If there are any defects in the information received from the local agencies, there is very little time to contact the latter and to secure better information. Also there is relatively very little time for statistical analysis of the information received. It is felt that these and similar difficulties would decrease considerably if the *Bulletin* were published only once a year.

In that case, the volume might be increased in size. Additional analyses could be added. It would be much easier to refer back to the agencies for better reports and perhaps for some additional information on the basis of the reports received.

A good example of the serious handicaps which impending deadlines, growing out of the necessity of putting out two publications per year, are responsible for, is the method for deriving the annual crime totals to which the FBI has to resort. This is discussed in the section of the report dealing with the "General United States Crime Statistics" under the subtitle "Estimating the Totals."

Another argument for having just 1 bulletin each year is that, with the present system of 2 bulletins, the data for a given year do not all appear in the annual bulletin covering that year but have to be included in the semiannual bulletin of the following year. Thus, for

instance, the *Annual Bulletin* for 1957, which was released on April 23, 1958, does not contain offenses cleared for 1957, because the publication of the *Annual Bulletin* is too early to permit inclusion of that type of data. "Offenses Cleared" for 1957 will appear only in the *Semiannual Bulletin* for 1958, which, as other semiannual bulletins, will not appear until early fall. If there were only one bulletin each year, it could be released approximately at the time of the present semiannual bulletin, and in that manner could handle all data for 1 year in 1 publication.

An important factor would be that a certain amount of repetition now appearing in the two bulletins would be eliminated, and that the same space, the same personnel, time and, in general, the same budgetary allotment could be utilized for publishing more data than is being done at the present time.

Recommendation (7): It is recommended that the present practice of publishing the UCR's as a semiannual and an annual bulletin be discontinued and only one annual bulletin be issued. A sufficient amount of time should be allowed for the tabulation and analysis of the data. The quality of the publication should not be allowed to suffer from impending deadlines. The fuller scope of the one annual publication—see recommendation (1)—will necessitate more preparation time. Issuance of intermediate publications of limited scope, which the FBI might find appropriate for release, is of course not precluded by this recommendation but is actually encouraged.

Classification of Offenses

Part I and Part II Offenses

The proposed agenda given the Committee by the FBI suggested looking into the advisability of revising the present distribution of offenses between Parts I and II, and more specifically a careful weighing of the arguments for and against retaining manslaughter by negligence and larceny below \$50 (petty larceny) among Part I offenses. The justifiability of this concern on the part of the FBI was well substantiated by the fact that the resource persons contacted in the course of the study very often volunteered concern with reference to the above two categories, and very many suggested the need for change. Still another category, namely that of auto theft, was questioned, although to a lesser extent.

Perusal of the references to the UCR's in the press shows that one of the major points on which misinterpretation of the published data or criticism thereof is apt to occur, is the composition of the Part I offenses.

An example of an instance in which the present reporting of Part I offenses recently came under attack involved criticism of the distribution of the offenses by age groups and the meaning attached thereto. While this matter is properly discussed in the part of the report dealing with juvenile offenses, it is referred to here because the criticism goes back to the weaknesses in the present structure of Part I. The Committee has in mind here a statement, originally appearing in the May 3, 1958, issue of *The New Yorker*, which was quoted and apparently endorsed by the Annual Conference of the International Juvenile Officers' Association in its Milwaukee meeting on May 23, 1958, and is reflected in that organization's resolutions. The essence of the criticism lies in the fact that while 47.2 percent of all persons arrested for Part I offenses which are labeled major crimes appear to be under 18 years of age—which, of course, represents an alarming situation indeed—in reality the immediate assumption that juveniles committed nearly half of all murders, aggravated assaults, rapes, etc., is erroneous, since, as a more detailed analysis in the UCR's indicates, juveniles are responsible primarily for the auto thefts and larcenies, and their participation in the above-cited three serious offenses is relatively low.

The above criticism is based largely on a misinterpretation, since the Uniform Crime Reports *Annual Bulletin* for 1957 itself points out (p. 113) that:

Although youths under 18 account for only 12.3 percent of arrests for all age groups, they make up 47.2 percent of the arrests for the Part I crimes of murder and nonnegligent manslaughter, negligent manslaughter, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary—breaking or entering, larceny—theft, and auto theft. The extent of the participation of youths in crime for the Part I classes is weighted by arrests for crimes against property.

Persons under 18 represented 53.1 percent of all arrests for the Part I crimes of robbery, burglary—breaking or entering, larceny—theft, and auto theft, but only 10.3 percent of all arrests for the Part I crimes against the person of murder, negligent manslaughter, rape, and aggravated assault.

Nevertheless this superficial and erroneous impression is highly undesirable. It is traceable to the composition of the Part I offenses: while bearing the title "major crimes," this group of offenses is numerically made up for the most part not of major crimes but of petty larcenies, culpable traffic fatalities, and auto thefts of the type referred to as joyriding.

The Committee studied and discussed in great detail the developmental history of the category of offenses known as "Part I offenses" and the present philosophy behind using this category as contrasted

with "Part II offenses." It established that, historically, the category of Part I offenses was the result of a compromise, in back of which were various differing proposals at the time the original committee of the International Association of Chiefs of Police formulated the plan for the Uniform Crime Reporting Program. It was also aware of at least one major change in the Part I offenses, made prior to the establishment of this Committee, viz., the elimination of statutory rape from that group.

The Committee came to the conclusion that the difficulties encountered in the separation of offenses into Part I and Part II as well as the problems created by the composition of Part I are due to the fact that the classification as such has several purposes in mind, or attempts to achieve a number of objectives. Each one of these objectives is a perfectly justifiable one, but the classification, being a compromise, does not fully accomplish any one of these. Therefore it is easily open to criticism from the standpoint of any one single objective. According to the Committee's analysis, the objectives which the current classification attempts to achieve or what might be called the classification criteria, are as follows:

1. Differentiation between the offenses which are best reported, as they become known to the police (Pt. I offenses) and those which are best reported as they become known to the law enforcement agencies through the arrest of the offender (Pt. II offenses).

2. Use of a certain number of offenses known to the police as an index of criminality. The crime situation in the country is evaluated on the basis of the statistics of Part I offenses. Generally speaking the criteria for a crime index, which were enumerated above, apply and were actually considered in developing the category of "Part I offenses."

3. Separation of offenses into more important and less important ones. The term "major crime" is very frequently used in the UCR's with reference to Part I offenses, by implication conveying the idea that Part II offenses are not major, i. e., evidently minor or less important offenses. Just what is the exact meaning of the term "major" is not quite clear.

4. Emphasis on the offenses which are especially important from the standpoint of the police. The Committee met with the attitude that some of the offenses should remain Part I offenses because that stresses their importance to the cooperating police departments, and, conversely, their removal from Part I would "deemphasize" them not only in the sense of reporting but also in the sense of their suppression.

As stated above, the Committee came to the conclusion that the separation of offenses into Part I and Part II does not satisfy all of the above four criteria, and that probably no single grouping of the offenses would either. Thus, for instance, it is quite obvious that, if

judged exclusively from the standpoint of criterion No. 1, i. e., the technique of recording, some of the Part II offenses should be transferred to Part I, because they could be better recorded as they become known to the police instead of waiting until an arrest is effectuated. A careful study would be necessary to definitely establish this, but offhand the question could be raised with reference, for instance, to forgery and counterfeiting, many types of fraud, several of the "all other offenses," etc.

From the point of view of criterion No. 2, i. e., the index of crime, several of the Part I offenses are out of place. Manslaughter by negligence, which category is made up almost exclusively of culpable traffic deaths, is certainly not a proper offense to be used for an index of criminality. Rape, for instance, even if statutory rape is excluded, is notoriously an offense which is not consistently reported to the police. As a matter of fact, rape is often used as an example of precisely the opposite, namely, of an offense which the victim and its relatives often hesitate to report because of the painfulness of the publicity attached. In many cases, on the other hand, a report of rape is made falsely. Larceny under \$50 is certainly not an offense that is consistently reported. These offenses are mentioned here only to illustrate the point which the Committee is attempting to make; a more detailed discussion of manslaughter by negligence and larceny follows under the respective headings.

As for criterion No. 3, i. e., the seriousness of the offense in the sense of its being a "major" or "nonmajor" offense, the lack of definiteness as to what "major" means should once more be pointed out. But it seems that whatever precise meaning is assigned to the term "major," petty larceny—below \$50—certainly does not qualify for inclusion in Part I on that score (except perhaps in the sense of numerical frequency). Concern about the fact that stolen hubcaps and minor thefts from the open counter are included in the category of "major crimes" is a repeated criticism of the UCR's. Perhaps one of the best statements of this criticism is in the FBI's own proposed agenda for the Committee's work. Moreover, the inclusion of joy-riding auto thefts in Part I solely by reason of being a "major offense"—whatever the meaning thereof—also can be questioned. On the other hand, depending again, of course, on the exact meaning of the term "major," several of the Part II offenses might possibly qualify.

Finally, from the standpoint of criterion No. 4, that is, the importance of the offense for police work, it seems that if that criterion alone were to be followed, considerable flexibility would be an important consideration in order to keep up with changes in the actual crime problems. Several offenses which are now in Part II would probably qualify.

In view of the above, the Committee recommends deemphasizing the present division of offenses into Part I and Part II and suggests achieving the several objectives which the present classification attempts to accomplish, by using several separate presentations or tabulations of statistical data. For this purpose the Committee makes the following recommendations:

Recommendation (8): In the UCR's published hereafter, the emphasis should be removed from the terminology Part I and Part II offenses. It is felt that if this terminology were retained in spite of considerable changes in the content of the groupings of offenses, confusion would result; new terms applied to a new classification would promote clarity.

Recommendation (9): It may be advisable to retain, at least for the time being, the current terminology of Part I and Part II offenses in the Bureau's communications with the cooperating police departments, since it is by now accepted practice and a tradition of long standing.

Recommendation (10): The publication of an index of crime, which function is presently performed by the Part I offenses, should be continued, but the tabulations should be entitled "index of crime" and the composition of the index be changed to exclude manslaughter by negligence and larceny below \$50 (for elaboration of this see the respective subtitles and also the subtitle "Auto Theft").

Recommendation (11): The general tabulations of United States crime statistics should be divided into those offenses which are reported as they become known to the police and those which are reported as they become known through the arrest of the offender.

Recommendation (12): The classification suggested in recommendation (11), which presently consists in the differentiation of Part I and Part II offenses, should be further studied by the personnel of the Bureau in consultation with experienced representatives of the police departments in order to determine the best manner of handling specific offenses.

Recommendation (13): A special section should be developed in the UCR's to deal with the group of offenses which at a given time are especially important to the police in its work, so as to increase the effectiveness of the police in combatting the particular offenses by focusing attention on them and providing additional information on their frequency and distribution and their success in suppressing them. Both offenses known to the police and offenses reported follow-

ing arrest might be included here. Again, continued study by the personnel of the Bureau in consultation with the best qualified representatives of the police departments should form the basis for including offenses in this section.

The following comment may serve to further clarify the above recommendations. If these recommendations are followed, the UCR's will contain three tabulations of groups of offenses, each one of which may be somewhat similar to the present Part I offenses, but would also differ from the latter; and all three would differ from each other. These three groups would be: (1) Offenses recorded as they become known to the police, within the general tabulation of the United States crime statistics; (2) offenses used for the purposes of the crime index; (3) offenses which are singled out as being at the given time of special importance to the police departments in their work. The sense of this change will be that each one of the three tabulations will be different from the Part I offenses in order to meet the objections to which this latter group is vulnerable when it is evaluated from the standpoint of each separate one of the three specific objectives. Each of the three new groups of offenses will satisfy one particular objective.

Manslaughter by Negligence

As to the nature of the offenses reported in this category and the ways in which they are reported, the following seems to be well established. Over 99 percent of all cases of manslaughter by negligence are made up of traffic fatalities which are attributable to culpable negligence. This represents the considered opinion of the experienced FBI staff involved in the preparation of the UCR's. As a matter of fact, the number of homicides other than traffic fatalities reported under negligent manslaughter is so small that it is hard to think of any example of anything else, the best one seemingly being the case of accidental shooting in the hunting season.

It also became apparent to the Committee that in the reporting of manslaughter by negligence the conventional situation characteristic of the crimes known to the police appears to be considerably modified. The police itself is hesitant to evaluate a case as negligent manslaughter rather than as an accident and has a tendency to await the action of the grand jury. It is reasonable to assume that the policies of the various police departments vary in that respect, and it is therefore justifiable to question the consistency with which this offense is reported as a crime known to the police.

The above two facts about negligent manslaughter make it a very suspect category from the point of view of its usefulness for an index of crime. In spite of the seriousness which the problem of traffic

fatalities represents nationally, this offense can hardly be characterized as a serious crime in the same sense in which other crimes are. In a sense, traffic fatalities are a function of the traffic volume and as such do not primarily measure crime but rather the extent to which a country uses automobiles. The fact that culpable negligence is undoubtedly present makes it possible to handle such instances as criminal offenses. Our concern about the magnitude of the problem and our desperate search to find a means to diminish it leads to our resorting to the strongest measure society has, namely, punishing it as a serious crime. But in essence the traffic fatality is not a criminal offense that is characteristic enough to be used as an index of the Nation's criminality.

It is true that, since it involves loss of life, manslaughter by negligence becomes known to the police regularly, but its classification under manslaughter, as pointed out above, very often does not represent police action and the degree of consistency in reporting on that score is not quite certain.

Another aspect in which the present way of reporting negligent manslaughter can be criticized is its appearance in the rural-urban distribution of crime and its use in the UCR's for the computation of the rural-urban rates. It is easily noticeable that a very substantial part of the cases of manslaughter by negligence takes place in the rural areas, i. e., they are reported by the rural police or the State police for the rural area. The reason is obvious: Automobile accidents, which constitute the vast majority of cases of negligent manslaughter and which take place on the highways in the rural areas, are included; these automobile accidents, however, represent offenses not only by the rural population, but also by cityfolk who are in a state of travel at the time of the accident. This certainly confuses the meaning of the rural-urban distribution of this offense.

From the point of view of police need, it might be important to know the place where the traffic fatalities occur, so that preventive and law-enforcement actions can be planned. In that sense it may be useful to tabulate negligent manslaughter in rural and urban categories. On the other hand, however, if used in the interpretation of the reasons for the offense, such tabulation gives rise to the impression that the offense is attributable to the rural population and is therefore misleading.

Recommendation (14): The category of manslaughter by negligence should be eliminated from the offenses used for the purposes of a crime index. It should however continue to be included in the United States crime statistics.

Tentative Suggestion (1): Manslaughter by negligence should be studied for inclusion in the proposed new section of the UCR's dealing with offenses that are especially important to the work of the police.

The suggestion has been made that consideration be given to using the traffic-fatality data collected, tabulated and published by the National Safety Council. The Committee is uncertain to what extent an agency like the FBI should depend in its reports exclusively on information assembled by an outside nonofficial organization. As **Tentative Suggestion (2)** the Committee recommends looking into the possibility of making use of the statistics on traffic fatalities compiled by some such agency, provided this source is competent and reliable.

Petty Larceny

There seems to be a rather strong conviction on the part of the police authorities that theft, regardless of how small, represents an important type of crime which in general is rather consistently reported to the police and is therefore a very suitable crime to be included in the crime index.

There are, however, reasons why the inclusion of petty theft in the crime index might be questioned below the level of felonious theft. One of these reasons is the fact that some of the petty larcenies are extremely minor offenses. Another reason for not including petty theft is the question of the consistency of reporting. In such major areas of larceny as, for instance, shoplifting, the policies of the firms involved often are against contacting the law enforcement agencies for the purpose of prosecuting customers who engage in petty stealing. In that case, not to report must very often be considered the policy of the firm. It would, of course, be against the theory of the crime index to use an offense of this kind. In that connection information given in the proposed agenda for the Consultant Committee is very significant. According to this information, thefts of bicycles, auto accessories, and other thefts from automobiles in 1956 represented over 50 percent of all the larcenies, while approximately one-seventh of the larcenies represented property under \$5 in value. Moreover it has been found difficult to determine when a bicycle is actually stolen and when it is borrowed by some other child, and in the case of hubcaps, or license plates it is very difficult to distinguish whether these items were actually stolen or perhaps lost and reported stolen merely for insurance purposes.

In view of all this, the suggestion that the petty larcenies be stricken from the offenses used for index purposes should be given serious consideration. There is again, of course, the question of the continuity

of a statistical series, which was discussed earlier. Therefore it is hoped that if petty larcenies are excluded from the index, they will be reported in such a way that anyone interested in the time series and comparisons could easily add the petty larcenies to the other offenses which will hereafter make up Part I and in that way reestablish the category currently used in the series. Perhaps one might even suggest that in deference to the fact that petty larcenies were for so many years included in the larceny figures in the Part I offenses, one might have a special figure, at least for a while, appear in the UCR's which would include both felonious and petty larcenies.

Recommendation (15): The present division of larceny into cases of over and under \$50 should be retained. The criteria for distinction should be further studied. Only larcenies above \$50 should be used for the purposes of the crime index. Larcenies under \$50 should be reported as offenses known to the police in the general tabulation of the United States crime statistics.

Auto Theft

The question has come up whether auto theft, which at present is one of the Part I offenses, should be included in the crime index. The arguments against inclusion are mainly two: (1) Auto theft does not constitute a uniform category, since it includes as widely different offenses as professional theft of car parts and cars for stripping and resale on the one hand, and juvenile joyriding on the other. (2) Joyriding, which comprises a very substantial portion of the auto thefts, is presumably not an offense of such an inherently criminal nature as to appropriately be used for the purposes of a crime index.

The arguments in favor of retaining auto theft for crime index purposes are: (1) The extremely high consistency of reporting. An auto theft, especially in view of the insurance involved, is almost always reported; (2) a stolen car usually represents a relatively very high value, and almost automatically qualifies as grand larceny. The Committee decided to retain auto theft for the purposes of the crime index.

Matters Discussed (2): Auto theft as a Part I offense. The Committee decided on continuing the present practice, except that in view of the general changes in the structure of the UCR's, auto theft will from now on be included in the group of offenses going into the crime index.

General United States Crime Statistics

When the purposes of the presentation of criminal statistics in the UCR's were discussed earlier in this Report, the general tabulation of police statistics on crime was pointed out as one of the major objectives. The Committee fully endorsed this objective—see Recommendation (4)—and suggested further expansion of the collection of data with reference to the Part II offenses so as to achieve more complete coverage for the urban areas and to include also the rural population—see Recommendations (5) and (6).

Several issues are involved in the presentation of these general crime statistics, and the Committee considered four of these as especially important. The UCR's analyze separately offenses reported for the urban and the rural areas and present crime rates, estimated crime totals and trends. The Committee discussed the desirability of this type of presentation and agreed that this analysis is very meaningful and should by all means be retained. But the following questions arise: (1) The question pertaining to the division of the United States population into urban and rural; (2) the question of the population base used for the computation of the crime rates; (3) the method of arriving at estimated totals for the entire United States on the basis of the available reports, which give criminal offenses only for part of the country; and (4) the method used in the presentation of trends. It can immediately be seen that especially the first 3 of these issues are very much interrelated, since all 3 of them revolve around the availability of sufficiently recent and accurate population figures. Therefore, although they will be handled separately for the sake of simplicity of presentation, it will be noticed that they all go back to one and the same basic problem.

Rural Versus Urban Criminality

The major problem involved in analyzing criminality on the basis of reports by rural and urban areas was pointed out in the tentative agenda drawn up by the FBI for the work of this Committee, namely, that the rapid trend toward urbanization, combined with the trend toward suburban living, leads to a situation where areas which administratively are rural, are in reality inhabited by urban people. Thus part of the crimes attributed to the rural population because they are reported by police departments which are rural according to their organization, are in reality committed by city people. This is especially damaging for the accuracy of the crime rates; since these are generally higher for the urban areas, a considerable amount of distortion may result. This may be one of the explanations for the

recently apparent relatively more rapid increase in rural criminality as reported in the UCR's. In the above-mentioned agenda, the FBI itself raised the question whether it should not perhaps "resort to a reliable sample for rural crime reporting."

The Committee discussed the substitution of a sampling technique in rural crime reporting for the present method, which attempts to obtain full information on rural criminality, and advises against the change, at least for the reporting of crimes known to the police. The main reason for this stand of the Committee was its desire to preserve the present general objective of the Uniform Crime Reporting Program to collect full information on criminality in the United States. Instead, the Committee recommends making use of the new analytical category introduced by the Bureau of the Census in its 1950 decennial census, viz., Standard Metropolitan Areas.

Standard Metropolitan Areas are generally speaking urban in nature and contain a minimum of population which still adheres to the rural way of life. At the same time these areas are made up of governmental units, i. e., cities and counties (in New England cities and towns). Thus they do not cut across the areas for which police crime reports are available and the population figures can thus be used for the needs of police crime statistics. The Bureau of the Census was consulted in this matter, and it was found that the Census plans to continue the use of the Standard Metropolitan Areas in future censuses.

For the population living outside of the Standard Metropolitan Areas¹ the present differentiation into urban and rural communities should be continued, making use of the 1950 census definitions of these terms, which differ slightly from the earlier ones. It should be noted that no use can be made at this point of the category of "urban fringe," introduced by the census in 1950, since the areas assigned to this category cut across the political or administrative boundaries and consequently cannot be used for the tabulation of police data.

Matters Discussed (3): The Committee discussed the possibility of substituting a sampling method for the present collection of criminal statistics for rural areas for crimes known to the police and advises against the change.

Recommendation (16): The Committee recommends the following plan for the analysis of the crime data into rural and urban. The population of the area of the United States should be divided into three types of communities:

¹ According to the United States 1950 census, of a population of about 150 million, 84 million were living in Standard Metropolitan Areas, and according to a 1956 sample study by the Bureau of the Census, of the approximately 164 million in 1956, 96 million were living in Standard Metropolitan Areas.

1. Standard Metropolitan Areas as established by the Bureau of Census for the 1950 census and as these may be further revised by that Bureau.

2. Urban communities, that is, generally speaking communities with more than 2,500 inhabitants. More specifically the current (1950) Census definition should be used. The urban population which is not comprised within the Standard Metropolitan Areas would be taken care of in this category.

3. Rural population, again in accordance with the current (1950) census definition. This would amount to the total rural population except for the small part which is included in the Standard Metropolitan Areas. It is believed that this would give for the United States the rural population in the truest sense of that word, for which statistical data is currently available.

At the request of the Committee this plan has been tested by the Statistical Section of the FBI for the States of Illinois and Maryland. Tabulations were prepared in accordance with the three suggested categories, and although the Committee did not feel it necessary to pursue this plan in all final detail, the experience gained showed that the plan is workable for the tabulation of the crime data received from the cooperating police departments. The FBI personnel concerned was also agreed on the workability of the plan, which, was likewise discussed with personnel of the Census Bureau and the tentative reaction there was also favorable as to the feasibility of the plan from the point of view of the census data. For the exploratory tabulations for the States of Illinois and Maryland and the respective Standard Metropolitan Areas, see Appendix 2.

The advantages of this plan for estimating the crime totals, which will be discussed under the pertinent subtitle, will be mentioned there.

Crime Rates

A considerable amount of the information appearing in the UCR's is converted into crime rates, with the population of the areas covered by the reports serving as the base. The FBI's proposed agenda for this Committee contains the statement: "The rates are calculated for the purpose of furnishing a yardstick with which to assist local administrators in measuring the current magnitude of the police problem at hand." The Committee felt it hardly necessary to argue the importance of the computation of rates, which are not only desirable but often crucial for the meaningfulness of statistical data of this nature.

And yet, the question of the crime rates has heretofore been one of the most difficult problems for the UCR's to cope with and has

probably been the most frequent subject for criticism. The reason for the difficulty is that the official population figures used by the FBI are the decennial United States Census figures, which, with every additional year further away from the census-taking, become further and further removed from reality. The differential rate of population growth in various communities makes communities with a rapid rate of growth appear exaggeratedly criminalistic in terms of the rates of offenses reported by the police. Conversely, the slower-growing communities are apt to appear in a favorable light toward the end of the decade. Thus, when the population basis is changed with the new census figures becoming available, sudden drastic upward or downward shifts in the crime rates appear for some areas.

The Committee recommends against using the decennial census figures except for the year of the census. It feels that official annual population estimates, based on sample studies and other techniques should be used instead. This is especially suitable for the purpose of the crime statistics since the introduction of the new analytical categories in the most recent United States census, especially the category of Standard Metropolitan Areas, which was discussed under the preceding subtitle in connection with rural-urban analyses.

The following annual estimates appear to be available from the Bureau of the Census: First of all there is, of course, an annual estimate for the total United States population, and there are such estimates for the individual States. Moreover, annual estimates are available for the total population of the Standard Metropolitan Areas and for the total urban and rural populations outside of the Standard Metropolitan Areas. It would probably also be possible to obtain an annual estimate for the population of all metropolitan areas of 100,000 and over. The Committee gained the impression that with not too much of an additional budgetary outlay, the Bureau of the Census could supply the Department of Justice with annual population estimates for the Standard Metropolitan Areas on an individual basis, if so requested.

The Committee discussed the feasibility of obtaining annual population estimates for various communities from other than official governmental sources. Many such estimates are available¹ and are being widely used, e. g., in business. The Committee would limit itself, however, to the tentative suggestion to the FBI that the possibility of resorting to that kind of estimates be explored.

As a result of the study reflected in the above discussion, the Committee makes the following recommendations:

¹ See, e. g., U. S. Bureau of the Census. "Local Population Estimates Prepared by State and City Agencies: 1957-58." *Current Population Reports-Population Estimates*, Series p. 25, No. 178, June 27, 1958.

Recommendation (17): In view of the differential population growth in various communities, the decennial census figures should not be used for the computation of the crime rates beyond the year to which they pertain. Instead, the available annual estimates by the Bureau of the Census should be used. It is felt that the plan for utilizing in the rural-urban analyses the analytical categories recently introduced by the Bureau of the Census would prove of value also in the computation of the crime rates. It is hereby also recommended that the FBI further explore the possibility of obtaining more detailed annual estimates from the Bureau of the Census.

Tentative Suggestion (3): The possibility of using annual population estimates by other than governmental agencies should be explored.

Estimating the Totals

In spite of the remarkably high degree of cooperation by the police departments in supplying the Uniform Crime Reporting Program with crime data, complete coverage can hardly ever be expected in a program of this sort.

There is a natural interest in having figures for the total amount of crime in the entire country or in a given community, calculated on the basis of the amount of crime reported by the cooperating departments. Besides, since not necessarily the same police departments respond each year, the estimated totals gain in importance as the figures which are to be used for comparisons from year to year and as the basis for the calculation of trends. The only other method that might be used for the latter purposes instead of using the estimated totals would be to exclude from the entire time series those communities which have failed to respond even once, but this would tend to reduce the reporting universe unnecessarily. The use of estimated totals suggests itself whenever one or several segments of the unit under study fail to report.

The FBI has for a long time resorted to estimating certain totals in the UCR's. The Committee was informed by the staff members about the various ways used in the past to achieve this. There is no point in recounting the former methods here or the changes which gradually took place. It is necessary, however, to describe briefly the currently-used method in arriving at such estimates.

Each year, after the reports on the Part I offenses have been received from the cooperating departments for the entire year, a comparison is made between the number of offenses for the current year and the number of offenses reported the previous year. The comparison is always based on the information supplied by those depart-

ments which responded both years. The comparison is made separately for the rural and urban areas and for the eight offenses which make up Part I. Percentage differences are noted and are considered indications of trends. Then the estimated number of offenses for the previous year, each offense type, rural and urban separately, are increased or decreased, depending on the established trend. Addition of the 16 figures obtained gives the estimated total of "major crimes" for the entire country for the given year. The Committee labelled this method of obtaining estimates of the totals, Method A. It will be noted that the estimate for a given year is derived from the estimate for the previous year, and so on. The year which served as the basis for this continuing series of estimates was, and still is, 1947. In that year extensive studies were made to arrive at the estimate.

Method A is not, however, the only method involved in the production of the estimated totals. Later in the year, after the estimated totals arrived at by Method A have been published, a more intensive study, which is impossible prior to publication because of the imminence of the deadline, is made. Estimated urban and rural totals are developed separately. For arriving at the estimated totals of urban crime, the following steps are taken: The cities, divided into 6 groups by size, are taken separately by groups for the 9 geographic divisions of the country. This makes 54 units. The offenses reported by the police departments for each one of these units are then tabulated. If not all departments have responded, the figure for each one of the offenses is increased accordingly.

On the basis of the previous decennial census figures, the total number of offenses is estimated proportionately to the part of the population for which the reports have come in. Since, as indicated above, the 8 Part I offenses are handled separately, this produces eight times 54, that is, 432 figures, the sum-total of which gives the estimated total of urban criminality for the entire country. For the rural area the separation into nine geographic divisions is not used. Experience has shown that the differences between the regions are so slight that there is no point in using them. Of course, there is no grouping by size of communities. Thus the estimated total for rural crime is arrived at simply by comparing the number of offenses reported for the portion of the rural population represented by the cooperating departments and the total rural population. Heretofore, again, the previous decennial figures have been used. The Committee labeled this method of arriving at the estimated totals, Method B.

The use made of the figures arrived at by Method B is as follows: These figures are used at the time of the calculation of the estimate for the next year as a supplementary step in Method A, but for the

purpose of clarity of presentation this was not mentioned when the latter method was described. One might say that the figures arrived at by Method B serve as a control device in the sense of comparing with them the figures arrived at by Method A. As the staff pointed out, usually no appreciable discrepancy appears.

The main device for making adjustments, if the above-mentioned control device should indicate the need for such, is the use of a correction factor. This correction factor was developed on the basis of an intensive study of the rural crime reporting, which was undertaken also in 1947. In this study, the rural crime figures obtained from communities which were known to have excellent crime reporting were compared with the overall rural figures received from all over the country. Considerable under-reporting was discovered especially for two offenses: Larceny and auto theft. Since that time the rural crime estimates have been "blown up" by injecting the correction factor for larcenies and auto thefts. In 1947 this correction factor amounted to 150 and 100 percent respectively for the 2 offenses. In view of the general improvement in rural crime reporting, it was felt in time, however, that the correction factor should be less, and it is now considerably lower than in 1947.

One of the main objections to the current procedure, as described above, is that the estimated totals of major crimes, as published for a particular year, are not based on the reports of the offenses known to the police for that year, except insofar as the latter are used to calculate the percentage increases and decreases (trend) in the separate crime categories and these are then applied to the estimate of the previous year. It will be recalled that each year, as described above, after publication of the bulletin containing the major crime estimates, the Bureau develops by means of Method B the major crime estimates for the same year on the basis of the crime reports for that year. This calculation is not published, but is used as a control device in calculating the estimate for the next year. This procedure should be discarded, since it is not and probably should not be published in the UCR's in view of the nature of the publication, and secondly, because it injects a certain amount of arbitrariness even if this arbitrariness is applied on the basis of the best judgment of the expert staff thoroughly familiar with the quality of the reports coming in from the police departments.

The current procedure could also be interpreted as follows: In view of the impending deadlines, the major crime estimates are published on the basis of the calculation here referred to as Method A. The reports from the local departments for the given year are really analyzed only after publication of the bulletin and are used in the computation of the estimates for the next year. Since the figure for the current year is already published, the FBI is constrained by it

and injects the necessary correction suggested by the results of Method B, by manipulation of the rural "correction factor" and of percentage increases and decreases. In spite of the fact that this procedure is based on the best judgment of experts, and in spite of the fact that when taken over a period of years it probably does give a reasonably accurate picture of crime, it can hardly be justified statistically as a permanent procedure.

The Committee feels that in view of the above, the currently-used method for computation of the crime estimates, while having merit in the past, should now be changed. The reason for recommending the change, stated more generally, is the fact that the amount of statistical manipulation in back of the figures which are currently presented in the UCR's as major crime totals are unnecessarily complicated and too many; a more direct and simple procedure should be substituted. The calculations involving estimates between the reports submitted by the police department, and the figures finally published in the UCR's should be as few, as simple and as clear as possible, and should be briefly described in the bulletins.

Another point which the Committee would like to make is that the estimates of the total crimes in the Nation, made on the basis of the total number of offenses submitted by the reporting departments all over the country, separately by urban and rural police, are based on the assumption that the portions of the population for which no reports were received have the same crime rates as those for which reports were received. It seems to be safer to estimate the offenses for the nonreporting sections of the country individually by separate States rather than for the country as a whole or for geographic divisions. Presumably, the situation with regard to criminality within individual States is somewhat more homogeneous than in the country as a whole. Law enforcement is a State matter, as is criminal legislation. A national total which is a composite of State totals, which in turn are computed on the basis of the portions of the State which actually reported the offenses is therefore a better estimate. The same would apply, of course, to the various components of the total, such as city crimes, rural crimes, or any specific category of crime. It is believed that under the procedure discussed in "Rural Versus Urban Criminality," such computation on the basis of States will be quite convenient and feasible.

Recommendation (18): In computing the estimated totals of major crimes the procedure suggested under the heading "*Rural Versus Urban Criminality*" should be utilized. Offenses known to the police should be computed from the police reports for the Standard Metropolitan Areas, for the rest of the urban population and for the rural population within each State (1950 United States census definitions).

The number of reported offenses should then be proportionately increased to take care of the unreported portions, if any, of these same categories within each State. The sum total of the estimates for the States thus obtained will give the national estimate for the given year. It is hoped that wherever available the annual population estimates by the United States census will be substituted for the currently-used decennial census figures.

The Committee has encountered the opinion on the part of some of the resource persons with whom these matters were discussed, that in addition to the estimates of the totals, the totals of actually-reported figures should be more prominently displayed in the UCR's. The reasoning behind this suggestion is that the estimated totals, even if the methods employed in arriving at these estimates are described, still represent a figure which does not, so to say, actually exist, but is derived on the basis of certain statistical manipulations. Presumably, there would be a certain advantage in having the figure which actually represents the known offenses more closely associated with the estimated data. This means that, in addition to the estimates of the totals, the actual figures based on addition of all the crimes known to the police, both urban and rural, should be given. In view of the very considerable size of the population which actually does report, especially the city population, these figures, although not giving the total picture countrywise, would still be of great significance.

Recommendation (19): In view of the remarkable coverage for offenses known to the police, the actual figures representing the total number of offenses committed in the United States, both rural and urban, are very significant and should be presented more prominently and more accessibly.

The Trends

Indication of the trends in crime is a traditional part of the Uniform Crime Reports. Heretofore the trends were usually indicated by giving the figures or rates for the current and the previous year. Occasionally comparisons of a broader scope appeared, often very illuminating.

In the very beginning of its work the Committee discussed this matter of measuring trends with the staff of the FBI, and found that the staff had already discussed and was contemplating replacing the comparisons of the 2 most recent years by comparisons of the latest available figures with the averages of several years. The Annual Bulletin for 1957 contains several instances of such comparisons with the averages of the previous 5 years.

The Committee feels that wherever possible comparisons with more than 1 year should be made. The reasons for this recommendation are quite obvious. A previous year can be a year of especially high crime rates in general, or with reference to certain specific offenses. Or, on the contrary, it can be an unusually low year. If the previous year happens to be low, the figures for the current year will be interpreted as a trend in the direction of increased criminality. If the figures for the past year happen to be unusually high, the year under consideration will indicate a trend in the direction of lesser criminality. It is perfectly obvious that such conclusions can be very misleading, because regardless of its relationship to the previous year, the year under consideration may in reality fit very neatly into a longer-range trend in criminality, which might be just the opposite, or considerably different from, the one indicated by the comparison with the 1 single previous year. Comparisons with averages of several years will therefore be much more sound in most instances.

The technique which should be used in computing these averages probably will be dictated by the particular set of statistical data. Five-year averages suggest themselves as a convenient measure. Generally speaking, one would probably think in terms of average rates rather than absolute figures. It goes without saying that further comparisons, going beyond the 5-year averages, might be extremely illuminating as the series grows. Comparisons with 10-year and 20-year averages or the average of the entire preceding series might be in order, of course, one has to keep in mind changes that may have occurred in the statistical categories or in definitions; such changes are bound to occur in a series of some length. Thus one should not be swayed so far by the desire to make comparisons of this type as to overlook the fact that the data might not lend themselves to such comparisons. Moreover, it should be kept in mind that the registering of offenses by the local police departments and their reporting of these offenses improve with time, and the figures may therefore not be quite comparable. All these considerations should be carefully weighed in deciding on the use of one or the other type of comparison.

Recommendation (20): In the tabulations designed to demonstrate trends in the number of offenses, comparisons with more than only the previous year are recommended. The exact number of preceding years to be used for the purposes of such comparisons should probably be determined in each individual case, depending on the nature of the comparison and the nature of the data in question.

Present Data Gathering Versus Sampling

The Committee has considered the proposal that the UCR's resort to some sampling procedure rather than attempt, as heretofore, to collect information on crimes for the entire country. After carefully considering the advantages and disadvantages of both procedures, the Committee has reached the conclusion that the present procedure should be retained. The main argument in favor of this is the remarkable coverage by now achieved by the Uniform Crime Reporting Program in its statistical series of offenses known to the police (Pt. I offenses). Assuming that the trend toward increased coverage continues, more or less complete reporting will be a reality in a very few years.

In favor of a sampling procedure is of course the argument that a carefully drawn stratified sample would give a statistically more accurate picture than incomplete reporting for the total area. Moreover, handling of a small, although adequate, sample would be a much less extensive operation than the present program. Against the sampling procedure is the argument that all it would accomplish is a series of estimates for the country as a whole and, perhaps, for some major subdivisions. The nature of the program implies, however, a different and more extensive purpose. The cooperating police departments, various governmental agencies and the public in general are interested in the crime figures for individual communities, counties, towns, States, etc., assembled in such a way that meaningful comparisons are possible and trends can be discerned.

The Committee is aware of the fact that beginning with 1956 the Children's Bureau has been using a sampling procedure for its Juvenile Court Statistics. This is based on the Current Population Survey Sample developed by the Bureau of the Census. Of course, the Children's Bureau's statistical series has never had from the juvenile courts anything like the response the FBI has from the police departments in its "offenses known to the police" series.

It should be remembered, of course, that in addition to the tabulations based on the reported Part I offenses, the UCR's also publish figures which are based on much less complete reporting. The outstanding example of this are the arrest data by age, sex and race, which in the 1957 Annual Bulletin, for example, were based on reports from 1,473 cities with a 1950 population of 40,176,369. As long as the analyses of the data are limited in their reference to that particular population, the procedure is sound. The moment a generalization is made, however, which implies that these observations can be extended to the urban population of the United States as a whole, the procedure is exposed to the criticism that a representative stratified sample would produce a statistically much more sound picture.

With reference to all such tabulations, therefore, either 1 of 2 courses of action suggests itself. Either a definite attempt should be made by the FBI, with the assistance of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, to build up the reporting so as to achieve more or less complete coverage, comparable to that for "offenses known to the police," or a sampling technique should be resorted to.

Matters Discussed (4): Present procedures in collecting data for the Uniform Crime Reports versus sampling procedure. The consensus of the Committee is in favor of the present procedure.

Recommendation (21): With reference to all tabulations in the Uniform Crime Reports which are not based on "offenses known to the police" (Pt. I offenses), for which a high degree of coverage has been built up, 1 of 2 courses should be followed: Either a definite attempt should be made to build up the reporting to achieve more or less complete coverage, comparable to that for "offenses known to the police," or a sampling technique should be resorted to. See Recommendations (5) and (6).

Miscellaneous Offenses

In the course of its study the Committee received several requests for analyzing certain offenses with a view to their reclassification within the Uniform Crime Reporting Program.

The suggestion that arson, which presently is included among "all other offenses" in Part II, should be moved to Part I was given careful consideration. In view of the new methods suggested by the Committee for tabulating offenses *in lieu* of the present Part I, a recommendation that arson should be moved to Part I has, of course, lost its point. That arson is not a suitable offense to be used for the purposes of an index of crime is too obvious to require explanation here. Whether it is desirable to have arson included in the group labeled offenses of special importance to the police is questionable and, besides, in accordance with the Committee's general recommendation, should be decided by the staff of the Bureau in consultation with the police authorities. The only change that might be considered, therefore, is placing arson as a named offense in the "General United States Crime Statistics." Then the question would be whether it should be classified as a crime known to the police or as an offense reported on the basis of arrest. The latter issue should again be decided in accordance with the Committee's recommendation, i. e., in consultation with the police authorities. As regards placing arson as a named offense into the "General United States Crime Statistics," the Committee did not feel that there is any par-

ticular need for doing so. The fire departments receive information about fires and study these more frequently than the police. Thus more detailed and more complete information on arson might be expected from the fire departments. The fire marshal often takes on a case of fire directly, when suspicion exists that the case involves arson. As things stand now, arson is an offense which is reported to the police both incompletely and inconsistently.

Matters Discussed (5): Arson. The Committee feels that no change is indicated with reference to the present handling of arson.

The Committee also considered the suggestion that embezzlement be handled as a separate offense. Presently it is placed together with fraud as one of the categories of Part II. The Committee did not feel that this is an offense with reference to which the police can, generally speaking, do very much, or that the reporting of this offense to the police has much promise of being accurate or consistent. More than on anything else, the reporting depends on the policies of the firm or agency within which the embezzlement has taken place. Still, since fraud and embezzlement are two quite different offenses, the Committee was of the opinion that the question of their appearing in the UCR's as two distinct categories might be studied further.

Tentative Suggestion (4): The question of handling fraud and embezzlement as two separate offense categories in the tabulation of the "General United States Crime Statistics" should be studied further.

Juvenile Offenders

The Committee devoted a considerable amount of time to the study and discussion of the reporting of statistics on juvenile offenders.

The general issue was raised to what extent the introduction of the concept of juvenile delinquency into the law enforcement system of a state affects the principles involved in the reporting of offenses known to the police. The laws introducing the juvenile courts define juvenile delinquency as not being a crime, and a juvenile who is adjudged delinquent is generally not a criminal in accordance with the law. What effect does this have on the reporting of offenses before the identity of the offender has been established, since, if the latter turns out to be a juvenile, there is no crime under the law? What might be termed the material damage is there, but crime does not consist of an overt act alone; *mens rea*, either in the form of intent or culpable negligence,

must also be present. Since the law does not consider a juvenile capable of committing a crime, this "inner element" is lacking. It is true that also in the case of offenses by adults it sometimes turns out after the offense has been reported, that no crime was committed or a crime different from the one originally reported has actually taken place. But in the adult cases this is a matter of "human error," in spite of which crimes known to the police are considered the best statistics for the purposes of a crime index. In the case of a juvenile, however, it is presumably a matter of principle.

Having discussed this issue, the Committee felt that there is no sufficient basis for a change in current procedures, since in juvenile cases, just as in adult cases, the violations of the rights of people are recorded as they become known to the police and are later reported to the Uniform Crime Reporting Program.

The Committee discussed the resolution adopted by the International Juvenile Officers' Association at its Annual Conference in Milwaukee on May 23, 1958. This resolution reads as follows:

WHEREAS, research has revealed the inadequacy of Uniform Terminology in the area of Juvenile Control; and

WHEREAS, the International Juvenile Officers' Association is desirous of promoting a system of uniform terminology and reporting that will be in the best interest of the public, interested agencies and the members of this association: Now THEREFORE BE IT

RESOLVED, That this association recommend the following changes and additions be made in the manual of Uniform Crime Reporting as distributed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation as a medium for the collection of facts and statistics in the area of juvenile control:

1. That thefts under \$50 be removed from Part I and placed in Part II.
2. That the offenses of Escapees, Runaways, Truancy, and Vandalism be added to Part II.
3. That age grouping be extended, reaching down from the 15th year, by year and extended through 10 years and younger.
4. That a new table be added to show the handling of nonoffenders, i. e., Lost Children, Witnesses, Victims, and Neglected Children.
5. That a new table be added to show police disposition of all children handled, i. e., Released-Delinquency Not Sustained, Warned, Referred to Probation Department of Juvenile Court, and other dispositions.
6. That space be made available to show the actual number of children handled for offenses, actual number of children handled for nonoffenses, and the actual number of children placed in detention, . . .

As may be remembered, this action of the International Juvenile Officers' Association was mentioned earlier in this Report (p. 21) and reference was made to the erroneous interpretation of the information contained in the UCR's.

As to the specific recommendations made in this resolution, the Committee reached the following conclusions. The suggestion contained in No. 1 is being taken care of by the new plan recommended

in the section on "Classification of Offenses." If adopted, this will result in a generally somewhat different presentation of data.

With reference to suggestions Nos. 2-6, with the exception of vandalism in No. 2, the Committee feels that these data are not at the present time being handled in the UCR's because the entire area from which they stem has not so far been considered the proper subject for the Uniform Crime Reporting Program. The Committee is of the opinion that the data mentioned in the resolution is important, but whether the FBI should extend its activities into collection and analysis of statistics of this type should depend entirely on a policy decision of the FBI itself.

As to the question of vandalism, in keeping with its general recommendation—see Recommendation (12)—the Committee feels that the issue of singling out vandalism from the category of "all other offenses" should be decided by the staff of the FBI in consultation with the police authorities.

More specifically the Committee feels, e. g., that the offenses mentioned under No. 2 (except vandalism) are not criminal code offenses but rather juvenile delinquencies, and as was stated above, their inclusion into the scope of the UCR's is a policy decision for the FBI to evaluate and make. This is even more the case with reference to the items mentioned under No. 4, which are not even offenses but matters from the area of child welfare.

Matters Discussed (6): The Committee did not consider it necessary to make any specific recommendations with regard to the collection and reporting of data on offenders in the juvenile age bracket, believing that the FBI's entering into the juvenile field on a more intensive and extended basis would take the Uniform Crime Reporting Program outside of its originally planned and presently observed scope, which is a policy matter for decision by the FBI itself.

Various Editorial Matters

In the course of this study the Committee and its individual members on many occasions discussed various editorial questions involved in the publication of the UCR's with the staff responsible for the production of this publication. Some of the points raised were matters of opinion which could be handled in various ways. Other suggestions were readily accepted by the staff and, as a matter of fact, have already been incorporated in the issue of the Bulletin which

appeared since the Committee began its work. The Committee does not feel that a list of these items needs to be included in this report since they are not of a general nature but involve mostly questions of better organization and presentation of the materials.

Perhaps the essence of most of these suggestions could be summed up in the following statement. The UCR's are read by persons of varied backgrounds and interests. The police officer, the newspaperman, the scholar might be mentioned as typical consumers. Each of these approaches the information contained in the reports from a different point of view, with a different set of requirements in mind. While this enhances the importance of the UCR's, it places a heavy responsibility on the staff producing them, in the sense that the information has to be presented clearly and succinctly, with the least chance for misunderstanding and misinterpretation. In spite of the space this may require, it is necessary to have in each issue a statement on the essentials of the Uniform Crime Reporting Program and frequent references in the text to the principles and policies appearing in this statement. The staff engaged in the production of the UCR's should be complimented for having been alert to this need, and on the whole this problem has been handled very satisfactorily. The Committee feels, however, that the staff should be supported in the continuance of this indispensable feature of the publication. It is felt that if the Committee's recommendation to limit the publication of the bulletins to one annual issue is accepted, the handling of this explanatory material about the Uniform Crime Reporting Program will be even more effective.

A Permanent Technical Consultant Committee

In the course of its study the Consultant Committee gradually arrived at the conclusion that it would be advisable to have a committee made up of persons well versed in criminal statistics which would be available whenever needed by the FBI staff engaged in the production of the Uniform Crime Reports. This recommendation should not be interpreted as self-aggrandizement by the Consultant Committee. It grew out of the recognition of the extreme usefulness of the discussions with the Committee members to the Bureau staff. This feeling was repeatedly expressed by the staff. Nor should it be interpreted as an attempt on the part of this Committee to perpetuate itself. The thought of suggesting themselves for such a permanent technical committee is far from the minds of the present consultants.

Two questions arise in connection with the possible establishment of such a permanent technical consultant committee; namely, why there should be such a technical consultant committee when the Bureau already has a professional staff engaged in the production of the Reports, and how creation of such a committee can be justified when there already exists a special committee of the International Association of Chiefs of Police.

As to the first of the two questions, the functions of a technical consultant committee as compared to those of the Bureau staff would consist in: (a) Supplying the broader and more detached perspective of the outsider who is familiar with the field but is not himself engaged in the publication of the document; and (b) providing a more independent critical evaluation of the procedures used.

Compared to the committee of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the technical consultant committee would be made up of persons trained and professionally engaged in the practical and scientific use of criminal statistics rather than representing primarily the administrative interests of the police in the Uniform Crime Reports. The importance of the committee of the International Association of Chiefs of Police is in no way questioned by the suggestion that a permanent technical consultant committee be established.

It is felt that a more or less permanent committee of this type would offer considerable advantages over *ad hoc* committees, appointed as the need arises, since the membership of the permanent committee would gradually accumulate a more thorough and intimate knowledge of the problems faced by the Uniform Crime Reporting Program.

It is envisaged that the permanent technical consulting committee would meet and study matters related to the Uniform Crime Reporting Program as and when requested by the staff of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Recommendation (22): A permanent technical consultant committee should be established to be available to the Bureau staff for consultation whenever needed.

Respectfully submitted,

CHARLTON F. CHUTE,
STANLEY R. SCHROTEL,
PETER P. LEJINS, *Chairman,*
Consultant Committee on
Uniform Crime Reporting.

SEPTEMBER 29, 1958.

Appendix I

Proposed Agenda
by FBI
for
Consultant Committee
November 1957

Uniform Crime Reporting has been in existence since 1930, and over the years great strides have been made in this area of criminal statistics through the cooperation of local police and the FBI working together. However, problems in connection with the collection and publication of the data inherently abiding in this program suggest the time has come when a committee of three authorities in the field of criminal statistics, be employed in a consultant capacity by the FBI to review the project as it now stands for the purpose of making suggestions. These suggestions may cover any phase of the collection or publication of the data that comes to mind in light of the experience gained thus far. The following agenda is presented as a suggestion only and any other matters which appear pertinent for discussion should be frankly considered.

(1) Population sources

All rates published in the Uniform Crime Reports bulletin are based on the latest United States Bureau of the Census decennial census figures. The rates are calculated for the purpose of furnishing a yardstick with which to assist local administrators in measuring the current magnitude of the police problem at hand. In an effort to indicate the trend in crime from one year to the next, the FBI has presented in the Uniform Crime Reports bulletin other tabulations showing the offenses reported by a group of cities during the 2 or more years under study. Any communities known to have changed in their reporting procedure during any of the years under study are eliminated from the calculations. Should the FBI continue to publish crime tables as they now do? Is there some method available to take into account intracensal population changes?

(2) Rural crime reporting

In the past two decades there have been shifts in the population that appear to affect crime reporting. Many areas that were strictly rural in character now contain highly urbanized fringe areas adjacent to municipalities. Silver Spring and Bethesda, Md., just out of Washington, D. C., are typical examples. These growing fringe areas are still *rural according to police jurisdiction*, but their environmental structure is urban. Generally, urban crime rates are substantially higher than those in the strictly rural areas. This gives rise to the question as to whether this shift in population does not tend to distort the so-called rural crime rates to the extent that they may be inflated by the reporting of rural police agencies covering these increasingly urbanized fringe areas. Should the FBI attempt to resort to a reliable sample for rural crime reporting, the sample to represent areas that are popularly considered rural eliminating those classified by the Census Bureau as urbanized fringe areas in metropolitan districts?

(3) Part I offense classes

Does the experience in crime reporting to date indicate a need for further changes in the Part I offense classifications? One such change has been recently made upon the recommendation of the Committee on Uniform Crime Records of the International Association of Chiefs of Police. That involved the elimination of statutory rape from the rape classification.

For example: Other possible areas for consideration involve manslaughter-by-negligence and larceny. The FBI conducts a constant program of correspondence with contributing agencies in an effort to bring about uniformity in these classifications. In spite of such educational and corrective activity by the FBI for almost three decades many departments continue to report in the manslaughter-by-negligence classification the action of grand juries as distinguished from the results of police investigation. Under present arrangements a lack of uniformity in the manslaughter-by-negligence classification may be expected to continue indefinitely. The question is raised as to the significance of this classification from the criminal statistics standpoint as well as from the police standpoint.

Basically, the manslaughter-by-negligence classification represents traffic fatalities attributable to culpable negligence. The question may be raised as to whether this is important. Is not the important thing to the police and the public the number of traffic fatalities that occur as distinguished from the number attributable to the vague

term, culpable negligence? The National Safety Council tabulates and publishes traffic fatality data.

The FBI appears to be waging an almost endless battle to insure that reporting police agencies include minor thefts in their offenses known data. Some have expressed the thought this classification should be limited to felony larcenies, but this term is far from uniform among the States. Included in the problem of uniformity in the larceny classification would be the efforts of the FBI to include bicycle thefts. It is admittedly difficult to determine when a bicycle is actually stolen and when it is borrowed by some other child. Also, a substantial portion of larcenies represent thefts of auto accessories and personal property taken from automobiles. It has been found very difficult in some cases to distinguish whether a hubcap or license plate was lost and reported stolen merely for insurance purposes or was actually stolen. Bicycle thefts, auto accessories, and other thefts from automobiles in 1956 represented over 50 percent of all the larcenies. Approximately one-seventh of the larcenies represented property under \$5 in value. Should the larceny classification be limited to thefts over \$100, or would this merely shift the problem to one of obtaining uniformity in the value placed upon property stolen? Should the larceny classification be eliminated altogether except possibly for purse snatchings? One possibility would be to eliminate larceny from the Part I offense classification and to change the robbery classification to "robbery and purse snatching."

Appendix II

Exploratory Sample Tabulations of Population and Offenses Known to the Police, Utilizing Standard Metropolitan Areas—Prepared for the Committee by the Statistical Section of the FBI

Explanation: These sample tabulations have a twofold purpose. (1) They demonstrate the manner in which the crime reporting area of the country may be divided into three segments; (a) Standard Metropolitan Areas (SMA), (b) urban communities outside any SMA, and (c) rural areas. (2) They indicate the procedure which may be followed in arriving at State totals. They are not shown here to illustrate the exact format of tables to be published in the future. As an expedient, these tables show one figure for all the so-called Part I offenses and of course in actual tabulations this information would be presented separately as to individual offense categories. Hence, the only significance the following tables have is that of their serving as an illustration for the new methodology. They certainly should not be used as substantive statistical material for any kind of comparisons or as a basis for any kind of conclusions.

A. ILLINOIS

<i>Area</i>	<i>Population</i>	
SMA 026 Chicago, Ill.	5, 495, 364	
<i>Agencies reporting:</i>	<i>Population represented</i>	<i>Pt. I offenses known</i>
Evanston, Ill.	73, 641	1, 376
Oak Park, Ill.	63, 529	553
Chicago, Ill.	3, 620, 962	47, 368
Cicero, Ill.	67, 544	1, 022
Berwyn, Ill.	51, 280	468
East Chicago, Ind.	54, 263	1, 916
Gary, Ind.	133, 911	4, 910
Hammond, Ind.	87, 594	3, 095
Joliet, Ill.	51, 601	977
Aurora, Ill.	50, 576	843
Maywood, Ill.	27, 473	325
Elgin, Ill.	44, 223	489

A. ILLINOIS—Continued

SMA 026 Chicago, Ill.—Continued

<i>Area</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>Pt. 1 offenses known</i>
<i>Agencies reporting:</i>		
Waukegan, Ill.....	38,946	929
Lake County, Ill.....	80,640	721
Barrington, Ill.....	4,209	37
Highwood, Ill.....	3,813	57
Lake Forest, Ill.....	7,819	107
Libertyville, Ill.....	5,425	74
Mundelein, Ill.....	3,189	54
North Chicago, Ill.....	8,628	321
Zion, Ill.....	8,950	161
Cook County, Ill.....	150,637	978
Arlington Heights, Ill.....	8,768	110
Bellwood, Ill.....	8,746	169
Blue Island, Ill.....	17,622	346
Brookfield, Ill.....	15,472	215
Calumet City, Ill.....	15,799	936
Chicago Heights, Ill.....	24,551	866
Des Plaines, Ill.....	14,994	331
Elmwood Park, Ill.....	18,801	354
Evergreen Park, Ill.....	10,531	297
Forest Park, Ill.....	14,969	182
Glencoe, Ill.....	6,980	95
Glenview, Ill.....	6,142	167
Hinsdale, Ill.....	8,676	52
Homewood, Ill.....	5,887	137
Kenilworth, Ill.....	2,789	29
La Grange, Ill.....	12,002	248
La Grange Park, Ill.....	6,176	56
Lansing, Ill.....	8,682	73
Lincolnwood, Ill.....	3,072	121
Lyons, Ill.....	6,120	120
Markham, Ill.....	2,753	12
Melrose Park, Ill.....	13,366	335
Midlothian, Ill.....	3,216	19
Mount Prospect, Ill.....	4,009	14
Norridge, Ill.....	3,428	10
Northbrook, Ill.....	3,348	69
North Lake, Ill.....	4,361	133
North Riverside, Ill.....	3,230	44
Oak Lawn, Ill.....	8,751	308
Park Forest, Ill.....	8,138	368
Park Ridge, Ill.....	16,602	68
Riverdale, Ill.....	5,840	111
River Forest, Ill.....	10,823	158
River Grove, Ill.....	4,839	144
Riverside, Ill.....	9,153	90
Skokie, Ill.....	14,832	611
South Holland, Ill.....	3,247	19
Summit, Ill.....	8,957	146
Westchester, Ill.....	4,308	58
Western Springs, Ill.....	6,364	48
Wilmette, Ill.....	18,162	489
Winnetka, Ill.....	12,105	193

A. ILLINOIS—Continued

SMA 026 Chicago, Ill.—Continued

Area		Population	
SMA 026 Chicago, Ill.—Continued			
Agencies reporting:		Population represented	Pt. I offenses known
Du Page County, Ill.....		59, 134	617
Clarendon Hills (2,437) included, and Bensenville (3,754) included.			
Downers Grove, Ill.....		11, 886	216
Elmhurst, Ill.....		21, 273	315
Glen Ellyn, Ill.....		9, 524	23
Lombard, Ill.....		9, 817	20
Naperville, Ill.....		7, 013	101
Villa Park, Ill.....		8, 821	184
Wheaton, Ill.....		11, 638	75
Kane County, Ill.....		39, 570	107
Batavia, Ill.....		5, 838	13
Geneva, Ill.....		5, 139	12
St. Charles, Ill.....		6, 709	120
Will County, Ill.....		72, 142	662
Rockdale Junction (2,820) included.			
Lockport, Ill.....		4, 955	32
Lake County, Ind.....		45, 896	777
Crown Point, Ind.....		5, 839	45
Griffith, Ind.....		4, 470	130
Highland, Ind.....		5, 878	144
Hobart, Ind.....		10, 244	199
Munster, Ind.....		4, 753	82
Whiting, Ind.....		9, 669	114
Population and offenses represented by reports.....		5, 385, 672 (98.0%)	79, 120
Areas not represented:			
Deerfield, Ill.....		3, 288	
Highland Park, Ill.....		16, 808	
Broadview, Ill.....		5, 196	
Calumet Park, Ill.....		2, 500	
Dolton, Ill.....		5, 558	
Franklin Park, Ill.....		8, 899	
Harvey, Ill.....		20, 683	
Lemont, Ill.....		2, 757	
Morton Grove, Ill.....		3, 926	
Niles, Ill.....		3, 587	
Palatine, Ill.....		4, 079	
Phoenix, Ill.....		3, 606	
Robbins, Ill.....		4, 766	
Steger, Ill.....		4, 358	
Stickney, Ill.....		3, 317	
West Chicago, Ill.....		3, 973	
Westmont, Ill.....		3, 402	
Wilmington, Ill.....		3, 354	
East Gary, Ind.....		5, 635	
		109, 692 (2.0%)	
Total population and total estimated offenses.		5, 495, 364 (100.0%)	80, 735

A. ILLINOIS—Continued

Area	Population	
SMA 034 Davenport, Iowa, Rock Island-Moline, Ill. -----	234, 256	
<i>Agencies reporting:</i>	<i>Population represented</i>	<i>Pt. 1 offenses known</i>
Davenport, Iowa-----	74, 549	2, 064
Rock Island, Ill-----	48, 710	1, 064
Moline, Ill-----	37, 397	578
Rock Island County, Ill-----	30, 483	244
East Moline, Ill-----	13, 913	153
Silvis, Ill-----	3, 055	26
Population and offenses represented by reports-----	208, 107 (88. 8%)	4, 129
<i>Areas not represented:</i>		
Scott County, Iowa-----	26, 149 (11. 2%)	
Bettendorf, Iowa (5,132) in- cluded.		
Total population and total estimated offenses.	234, 256 (100. 0%)	4, 650
SMA 036 Decatur, Ill. -----	98, 853	
<i>Agencies reporting:</i>	<i>Population represented</i>	<i>Pt. 1 offenses known</i>
Decatur-----	66, 269	1, 651
Macon County-----	32, 584	313
Population and offenses represented by reports-----	98, 853 (100. 0%)	1, 964
<i>Areas not represented</i> -----	None	
SMA 095 Peoria, Ill. -----	250, 512	
<i>Agencies reporting:</i>	<i>Population represented</i>	<i>Pt. 1 offenses known</i>
Peoria-----	111, 856	3, 461
Peoria County-----	54, 299	316
Chillicothe-----	2, 767	26
Peoria Heights-----	5, 425	50
Creve Coeur-----	5, 499	9
East Peoria-----	8, 698	298
Morton-----	3, 693	23
Pekin-----	21, 858	249
Population and offenses represented by reports-----	214, 095 (85. 5%)	4, 432
<i>Areas not represented:</i>		
Tazewell County-----	32, 132	
Washington-----	4, 285	
	36, 417 (14. 5%)	
Total population and total estimated offenses.	250, 512 (100. 0%)	5, 184

A. ILLINOIS—Continued

Area	Population	
SMA 110 Rockford, Ill	152,385	
<i>Agencies reporting:</i>	<i>Population represented</i>	<i>Pt. I offenses known</i>
Rockford.....	92,927	1,422
Loves Park.....	5,366	49
South Beloit.....	3,221	9
Population and offenses represented by reports.....	101,514 (66.6%)	1,480
<i>Areas not represented:</i>		
Winnebago County.....	50,871 (33.4%)	
Total population and total estimated offenses.	152,385 (100.0%)	2,222
Area	Population	
SMA 128 Springfield, Ill	131,484	
<i>Agencies reporting:</i>	<i>Population represented</i>	<i>Pt. I offenses known</i>
Springfield.....	81,628	1,381
Sangamon County.....	49,856	285
Population and offenses represented by reports.....	131,484 (100.0%)	1,666
<i>Areas not represented</i>	None	
Area	Population	
Illinois Urban	1,241,263	
<i>Agencies reporting:</i>	<i>Population represented</i>	<i>Pt. I offenses known</i>
Cairo.....	12,123	327
Canton.....	11,927	99
Centralia.....	13,863	135
Collinsville.....	11,862	93
De Kalb.....	11,708	127
Dixon.....	11,523	147
Freeport.....	22,467	284
Jacksonville.....	20,387	276
Kewanee.....	16,821	137
La Salle.....	12,083	91
Macomb.....	10,592	24
Marion.....	10,459	110
Mattoon.....	17,547	283
Monmouth.....	10,193	145
Mount Vernon.....	15,600	303
Ottawa.....	16,957	181
Sterling.....	12,817	318
Streator.....	16,469	131
Urbana.....	22,834	258
Wood River.....	10,190	146
Alton.....	32,550	628
Belleville.....	32,721	419
Bloomington.....	34,163	717
Champaign.....	39,563	794

A. ILLINOIS—Continued

<i>Area</i>	<i>Population</i>	
Illinois Urban—Continued		
<i>Agencies reporting:</i>	<i>Population represented</i>	<i>Pt. 1 offenses known</i>
Danville.....	37, 864	586
East St. Louis.....	82, 295	1, 648
Granite City.....	29, 465	598
Galesburg.....	31, 425	451
Kankakee.....	25, 856	404
Quincy.....	41, 450	500
Belvidere.....	9, 422	5
Benton.....	7, 848	28
Bradley.....	5, 699	8
Bushnell.....	3, 317	14
Carmi.....	5, 574	19
Chester.....	5, 389	17
Christopher.....	3, 545	11
East Alton.....	7, 290	163
Edwardsville.....	8, 776	31
Eldorado.....	4, 500	
Flora.....	5, 255	40
Galena.....	4, 648	19
Galva.....	2, 886	4
Geneseo.....	4, 325	3
Georgetown.....	3, 294	30
Gillespie.....	4, 105	8
Harvard.....	3, 464	17
Herrin.....	9, 331	78
Highland.....	4, 283	61
Hillsboro.....	4, 141	12
Hoopeston.....	5, 992	38
Jerseyville.....	5, 792	31
Litchfield.....	7, 208	5
Madison.....	7, 963	197
Marseilles.....	4, 514	26
Mendota.....	5, 129	51
Metropolis.....	6, 093	65
Morris.....	6, 926	53
Morrison.....	3, 531	
Mount Carmel.....	8, 732	113
Murphysboro.....	9, 241	11
Normal.....	9, 772	121
Oglesby.....	3, 922	6
Olney.....	8, 612	52
Pana.....	6, 178	71
Paris.....	9, 460	77

A. ILLINOIS—Continued

Area		Population	
Illinois Urban—Continued			
Agencies reporting:	Population represented	Pt. I offenses known	
Pinckneyville.....	3, 299	1	
Pontiac.....	8, 990	68	
Princeton.....	5, 765	46	
Robinson.....	6, 407	52	
Rochelle.....	5, 449	30	
Rock Falls.....	7, 983	68	
Salem.....	6, 159	36	
Sandwich.....	3, 027	40	
Sparta.....	3, 576	2	
Spring Valley.....	4, 916	32	
Staunton.....	4, 047	60	
Sycamore.....	5, 912	11	
Taylorville.....	9, 188	29	
Tuscola.....	2, 960	15	
Vandalia.....	5, 471	27	
Venice.....	6, 226	173	
Westville.....	3, 196	1	
Woodstock.....	7, 192	15	
Gibson City.....	3, 029	1	
Aledo.....	2, 919	3	
Carlyle.....	2, 669	7	
Casey.....	2, 734	36	
McLeansboro.....	3, 008	8	
Nokomis.....	2, 544	22	
Oregon.....	3, 205	11	
Pittsfield.....	3, 564	17	
Sullivan.....	3, 470	15	
Farmington.....	2, 651		
Lewistown.....	2, 630	3	
Momence.....	2, 644	16	
Newton.....	2, 780	23	
O'Fallon.....	3, 022	13	
Rantoul.....	6, 387	153	
Waterloo.....	2, 821		
Population and offenses represented by reports.....		1, 041, 771 (83. 9%)	12, 879

A. ILLINOIS—Continued

Area	Population	
Illinois Urban—Continued		
Areas not represented:	Population represented	Pt. 1 offenses known
Abingdon.....	3,300	
Anna.....	4,380	
Beardstown.....	6,080	
Carbondale.....	10,921	
Carlinville.....	5,116	
Cartersville.....	2,716	
Charleston.....	9,164	
Clinton.....	5,945	
Crystal Lake.....	4,832	
Du Quoin.....	7,147	
Dwight.....	2,843	
Effingham.....	6,892	
Fairfield.....	5,576	
Fulton.....	2,706	
Greenville.....	4,069	
Harrisburg.....	10,999	
Havana.....	4,379	
Johnston City.....	4,479	
Lawrenceville.....	6,328	
Lincoln.....	14,362	
Paxton.....	3,795	
Peru.....	8,653	
Savanna.....	5,058	
Shelbyville.....	4,462	
Virden.....	3,206	
Washington Park.....	5,840	
Watseka.....	4,235	
West Frankfort.....	11,384	
White Hall.....	3,082	
Zeigler.....	2,516	
Marshall.....	2,960	
Carthage.....	3,214	
Monticello.....	2,612	
Alorton Village.....	2,547	
Brooklyn Village.....	2,568	
Marengo.....	2,726	
Mascoutah.....	3,009	
Mount Morris.....	2,709	
Rushville.....	2,682	
	199,492 (16.1%)	
Total population and total estimated of- fenses.....	1,241,263 (100.0%)	15,350

A. ILLINOIS—Continued

Area	Population	
Illinois Rural.....	1, 576, 909	
<i>Agencies reporting (counties):</i>	<i>Population represented</i>	<i>Pt. 1 offenses known</i>
Adams.....	23, 240	78
Alexander.....	8, 193	33
Brown.....	7, 132	13
Bureau.....	27, 030	104
Calhoun.....	6, 898	73
Clark.....	11, 668	16
Clay.....	12, 190	34
Coles.....	13, 617	168
Crawford.....	14, 730	102
De Kalb.....	20, 134	78
Douglas.....	13, 746	60
Edgar.....	13, 947	64
Edwards.....	9, 056	31
Effingham.....	14, 783	87
Fayette.....	19, 111	84
Ford.....	9, 077	36
Franklin.....	23, 392	67
Fulton.....	26, 508	94
Gallatin.....	9, 818	21
Grundy.....	12, 291	93
Hamilton.....	9, 248	33
Hancock.....	22, 576	112
Hardin.....	7, 530	22
Henderson.....	8, 416	29
Henry.....	22, 460	82
Iroquois.....	28, 113	67
Jersey.....	9, 472	82
Kankakee.....	39, 325	259
Knox.....	19, 641	136
La Salle.....	32, 935	96
Lawrence.....	14, 211	23
Lee.....	24, 928	31
Livingston.....	25, 924	178
Logan.....	16, 309	65
McDonough.....	14, 290	66
McHenry.....	32, 442	306
McLean.....	32, 642	125
Madison.....	63, 941	375
Marion.....	22, 238	271
Mason.....	10, 947	63
Menard.....	9, 639	66
Mercer.....	14, 455	73
Monroe.....	10, 461	8
Montgomery.....	18, 567	26
Morgan.....	15, 181	64
Moultrie.....	9, 701	94
Ogle.....	22, 066	15
Perry.....	11, 238	103
Piatt.....	11, 358	73
Pike.....	18, 591	48
Putnam.....	4, 746	11

A. ILLINOIS—Continued

<i>Area</i>	<i>Population</i>	
Illinois Rural—Continued		
<i>Agencies reporting (counties):</i>	<i>Population represented</i>	<i>Pt. 1 offenses known</i>
Randolph.....	22, 708	48
Richland.....	8, 277	85
St. Clair.....	73, 754	428
Schuyler.....	6, 931	13
Shelby.....	19, 972	69
Stephenson.....	19, 128	30
Vermilion.....	36, 733	425
Wabash.....	5, 919	14
Warren.....	11, 788	44
Washington.....	14, 460	70
White.....	15, 361	112
Whiteside.....	22, 299	337
Woodford.....	21, 335	48
Mount Olive.....	2, 401	5
Population and offenses represented by reports.....	1, 181, 218 (74. 9%)	6, 066
<i>Areas not represented (counties):</i>		
Bond.....	10, 088	
Boone.....	7, 648	
Carroll.....	13, 918	
Cass.....	9, 017	
Champaign.....	37, 316	
Christian.....	23, 450	
Clinton.....	19, 365	
Cumberland.....	10, 496	
De Witt.....	10, 949	
Greene.....	15, 770	
Jackson.....	17, 962	
Jasper.....	9, 486	
Jefferson.....	20, 292	
Jo Daviess.....	16, 811	
Johnson.....	8, 729	
Kendall.....	12, 115	
Macoupin.....	25, 335	
Marshall.....	13, 025	
Massac.....	7, 501	
Pope.....	5, 779	
Pulaski.....	13, 639	
Saline.....	17, 921	
Scott.....	7, 245	
Stark.....	8, 721	
Union.....	16, 120	
Wayne.....	15, 357	
Williamson.....	21, 636	
	395, 691 (25. 1%)	
Total population and total estimated offenses.	1, 576, 909 (100. 0%)	8, 099

B. MARYLAND

Area	Population	
SMA 011 Baltimore, Md.....	1, 337, 373	
<i>Agencies reporting:</i>	<i>Population represented</i>	<i>Pt. I offenses known</i>
Baltimore City.....	949, 708	22, 868
Anne Arundel County.....	107, 345	2, 409
Annapolis.....	10, 047	628
Baltimore County.....	270, 273	6, 423

Population and offenses represented by reports..... **1, 337, 373 (100. 0%) 32, 328**

Areas not represented..... None

Area	Population	
SMA 144 Washington, D. C.....	1, 464, 089	
<i>Agencies reporting:</i>	<i>Population represented</i>	<i>Pt. I offenses known</i>
Washington, D. C.....	802, 178	16, 354
Montgomery County, Md.....	155, 010	2, 599
Rockville (6,934) included.		
Prince Georges County, Md.....	148, 957	3, 495
Capitol Heights (2,729) included.		
Cheverly (3,318) included.		
College Park (11,170) included.		
Riverdale (5,530) included.		
Bladensburg, Md.....	2, 899	96
Greenbelt, Md.....	7, 074	189
Hyattsville, Md.....	12, 308	301
Laurel, Md.....	4, 482	177
Alexandria, Va.....	61, 787	2, 370
Arlington, Va.....	135, 449	2, 733
Fairfax County, Va.....	98, 557	2, 792

Population and offenses represented by reports..... **1, 428, 701 (97. 6%) 31, 106**

Areas not represented:

Mount Rainier, Md.....	10, 989
Takoma Park, Md.....	13, 341
Brentwood, Md.....	3, 523
Falls Church, Va.....	7, 535

35, 388 (2. 4%)

Total population and total estimated offenses. 1, 464, 089 (100. 0%) 31, 871

Area	Population	
Maryland Urban.....	167, 775	
<i>Agencies reporting:</i>	<i>Population represented</i>	<i>Pt. I offenses known</i>
Cumberland.....	37, 679	353
Hagerstown.....	36, 260	688
Brunswick.....	3, 752	15
Cambridge.....	10, 351	148
Crisfield.....	3, 688	16
Easton.....	4, 836	77

B. MARYLAND—Continued

<i>Area</i>	<i>Population</i>	
Maryland Urban—Continued		
<i>Agencies reporting</i>	<i>Population represented</i>	<i>Pt. I offenses known</i>
Elkton.....	5, 245	106
Frederick.....	18, 142	285
Pocomoke City.....	3, 191	16
Salisbury.....	15, 141	219
Westminster.....	6, 140	25
Aberdeen.....	2, 944	137
Population and offenses represented by reports.....	147, 369 (87. 8%)	2, 085
<i>Areas not represented:</i>		
Chestertown.....	3, 143	
Frostburg.....	6, 876	
Havre de Grace.....	7, 809	
Bel Air.....	2, 578	
	20, 406 (12. 2%)	
Total population and total estimated offenses.	167, 775 (100. 0%)	2, 375
<i>Area</i>	<i>Population</i>	
Maryland Rural.....		
<i>Agencies reporting (counties):</i>	<i>Population represented</i>	<i>Pt. I offenses known</i>
Allegany.....	45, 001	313
Westernport (3,431) included.		
Calvert.....	12, 100	63
Cecil.....	28, 111	119
Dorchester.....	17, 464	111
Frederick.....	40, 393	36
Garrett.....	21, 259	50
Harford.....	38, 451	150
Howard.....	23, 119	134
Talbot.....	14, 592	102
Washington.....	42, 626	172
Population and offenses represented by reports.....	283, 116 (59. 1%)	1, 250
<i>Areas not represented:</i>		
Caroline.....	18, 234	
Carroll.....	38, 767	
Charles.....	23, 415	
Kent.....	10, 534	
Queen Annes.....	14, 579	
St. Marys.....	29, 111	
Somerset.....	17, 057	
Wicomico.....	24, 500	
Worcester.....	19, 957	
	196, 154 (40. 9%)	
Total population and total estimated offenses.	479, 270 (100. 0%)	2, 115

Appendix III

List of Actions Taken by the Committee, Compiled from the Body of the Report

Explanation: The Committee's consideration of the issues raised led to three types of actions: A. Definite recommendations for change in the current practice in producing the Uniform Crime Reports—actions of this type are referred to as "Recommendations"; B. Tentative suggestions for the FBI to consider changing current practice after additional study by the Bureau—such actions are referred to as "Tentative Suggestions"; and C. Decisions that the current practice should be left as is—actions of this type are referred to as "Matters Discussed."

A. Recommendations

	<i>Page</i>
Recommendation (1)	13

Since the UCR's have outgrown being of use primarily to the law enforcement agencies, especially the police, and have become a basic source of information on crime for the country as a whole, the FBI should be encouraged to give as much recognition to this fact as is compatible with its program and be guided in the compilation and publication of the criminal statistics by the need to present these in such a way that the information will be meaningful to the general public and interested agencies and organizations even outside the immediate field of law enforcement.

Recommendation (2)	14
------------------------------	----

In making changes in the UCR's, the utmost care should be taken not to destroy the continuity of the statistical series. Wherever feasible, both versions, i. e., the old and the new, should be given, or the data should be presented in such a way that the reader himself can make the calculations necessary to utilize the data earlier collected and published.

Recommendation (3)	Page 17
------------------------------	------------

The objectives for collecting and presenting the statistical information on criminal offenses should be clearly formulated and adhered to at all times. A brief restatement of these objectives should appear in each issue of the UCR's to forestall misinterpretation of the data.

Recommendation (4)	17
------------------------------	----

In view of the officially stated purposes of the Uniform Crime Reporting Program and in view of the actual content of the UCR's, the objective of publishing statistics on criminal offenses should be interpreted as a twofold one, i. e., (1) Compilation and publication of a meaningful index of crime for the United States (presently accomplished by the reporting of Pt. I offenses); and (2) compilation and publication of the total volume of criminal offenses committed in the United States, by categories, perhaps entitled General Crime Statistics for the United States. It is understood that both of these statistical series are to serve as the basis for the computation of appropriate rates and trends and for making comparisons.

Recommendation (5)	17
------------------------------	----

In presenting the total crime picture for the United States, a tabulation including all offenses, perhaps with the exception of some minor ones, should be aimed at, which means that this tabulation should include not only offenses currently reported as Part I offenses but also those reported as Part II.

Recommendation (6)	18
------------------------------	----

In order to make the implementation of recommendation (5) possible, the collection of offenses of Part II, that is, offenses known through arrest, should be intensified in order to achieve more complete coverage for the urban communities, and a program of collecting this information for the rural area should be initiated. Various analyses, such as by age, sex, and race, which can presently be made only for a limited number of offenders could then be extended to the entire criminal population.

Recommendation (7)

It is recommended that the present practice of publishing the UCR's as a semiannual and an annual bulletin be discontinued and only one annual bulletin be issued. A sufficient amount of time should be allowed for the tabulation and analysis of the data. The quality of the publication should not be allowed to suffer from impending deadlines. The fuller scope of the one annual publication—see recommendation (1)—will necessitate more preparation time. Issuance of intermediate publications of limited scope, which the FBI might find appropriate for release, is, of course, not precluded by this recommendation but is actually encouraged.

Recommendation (8) 24

In the UCR's published hereafter, the emphasis should be removed from the terminology Part I and Part II offenses. It is felt that if this terminology were retained in spite of considerable changes in the content of the groupings of offenses, confusion would result; new terms applied to a new classification would promote clarity.

Recommendation (9) 24

It may be advisable to retain, at least for the time being, the current terminology of Part I and Part II offenses in the Bureau's communications with the cooperating police departments, since it is by now accepted practice and a tradition of long standing.

Recommendation (10) 24

The publication of an index of crime, which function is presently performed by the Part I offenses, should be continued, but the tabulations should be entitled "index of crime" and the composition of the index be changed to exclude manslaughter by negligence and larceny below \$50 (for elaboration of this see the respective subtitles and also the subtitle "Auto Theft").

Recommendation (11) 24

The general tabulations of United States crime statistics should be divided into those offenses which are reported as they become known to the police and those which are

reported as they become known through the arrest of the offender.

Recommendation (12) 24

The classification suggested in recommendation (11), which presently consists in the differentiation of Part I and Part II offenses, should be further studied by the personnel of the Bureau in consultation with experienced representatives of the police departments in order to determine the best manner of handling specific offenses.

Recommendation (13) 24, 25

A special section should be developed in the UCR's to deal with the group of offenses which at a given time are especially important to the police in its work, so as to increase the effectiveness of the police in combating the particular offenses by focusing attention on them and providing additional information on their frequency and distribution and their success in suppressing them. Both offenses known to the police and offenses reported following arrest might be included here. Again, continued study by the personnel of the Bureau in consultation with the best qualified representatives of the police departments should form the basis for including offenses in this section.

Recommendation (14) 26

The category of manslaughter by negligence should be eliminated from the offenses used for the purposes of a crime index. It should, however, continue to be included in the United States crime statistics.

Recommendation (15) 28

The present division of larceny into cases of over and under \$50 should be retained. The criteria for distinction should be further studied. Only larcenies above \$50 should be used for the purposes of the crime index. Larcenies under \$50 should be reported as offenses known to the police in the general tabulation of the United States crime statistics.

Recommendation (16)	30
-------------------------------	----

The Committee recommends the following plan for the analysis of the crime data into rural and urban. The population of the area of the United States should be divided into three types of communities:

1. Standard Metropolitan Areas as established by the Bureau of Census for the 1950 census and as these may be further revised by that Bureau.

2. Urban communities, that is, generally speaking communities with more than 2,500 inhabitants. More specifically the current (1950) census definition should be used. The urban population which is not comprised within the Standard Metropolitan Areas would be taken care of in this category.

3. Rural population, again in accordance with the current (1950) census definition. This would amount to the total rural population except for the small part which is included in the Standard Metropolitan Areas. It is believed that this would give for the United States the rural population in the truest sense of that word, for which statistical data is currently available.

Recommendation (17)	33
-------------------------------	----

In view of the differential population growth in various communities, the decennial census figures should not be used for the computation of the crime rates beyond the year to which they pertain. Instead, the available annual estimates by the Bureau of the Census should be used. It is felt that the plan for utilizing in the rural-urban analyses the analytical categories recently introduced by the Bureau of the Census would prove of value also in the computation of the crime rates. It is hereby also recommended that the FBI further explore the possibility of obtaining more detailed annual estimates from the Bureau of the Census.

Recommendation (18)	36, 37
-------------------------------	--------

In computing the estimated totals of major crimes the procedure suggested under the heading "*Rural versus Urban Criminality*" should be utilized. Offenses known to the police should be computed from the police reports for the Standard Metropolitan Areas, for the rest of the urban population and for the rural population within

each State (1950 United States census definitions). The number of reported offenses should then be proportionately increased to take care of the unreported portions, if any, of these same categories within each State. The sum total of the estimates for the States thus obtained will give the national estimate for the given year. It is hoped that wherever available the annual population estimates by the United States census will be substituted for the currently used decennial census figures.

Recommendation (19) 37

In view of the remarkable coverage for offenses known to the police, the actual figures representing the total number of offenses committed in the United States, both rural and urban, are very significant and should be presented more prominently and more accessibly.

Recommendation (20) 38

In the tabulations designed to demonstrate trends in the number of offenses, comparisons with more than only the previous year are recommended. The exact number of preceding years to be used for the purposes of such comparisons should probably be determined in each individual case, depending on the nature of the comparison and the nature of the data in question.

Recommendation (21) 40

With reference to all tabulations in the Uniform Crime Reports which are not based on "offenses known to the police" (Pt. I offenses), for which a high degree of coverage has been built up, 1 of 2 courses should be followed: Either a definite attempt should be made to build up the reporting to achieve more or less complete coverage, comparable to that for "offenses known to the police," or a sampling technique should be resorted to. See recommendations (5) and (6).

Recommendation (22) 46

A permanent technical consultant committee should be established to be available to the Bureau staff for consultation whenever needed.

B. Tentative Suggestions

Tentative Suggestion (1)	Page 27
<p>Manslaughter by negligence should be studied for inclusion in the proposed new section of the UCR's dealing with offenses that are especially important to the work of the police.</p>	
Tentative Suggestion (2)	27
<p>The Committee recommends looking into the possibility of making use of the statistics on traffic fatalities compiled by some agency other than the FBI, provided this source is competent and reliable.</p>	
Tentative Suggestion (3)	33
<p>The possibility of using annual population estimates by other than governmental agencies should be explored.</p>	
Tentative Suggestion (4)	41
<p>The question of handling fraud and embezzlement as two separate offense categories in the tabulation of the "General United States Crime Statistics" should be studied further.</p>	

C. Matters Discussed

Matters Discussed (1)	19
<p>After studying various considerations involved in the question as to the frequency with which crime reports are sent the FBI by the police, the Committee decided not to recommend any change in the current practice.</p>	
Matters Discussed (2)	28
<p>Auto theft as a Part I offense. The Committee decided on continuing the present practice, except that in view of the general changes in the structure of the UCR's, auto theft will from now on be included in the group of offenses going into the crime index.</p>	

Matters Discussed (3)	Page 30
-----------------------	------------

The Committee discussed the possibility of substituting a sampling method for the present collection of criminal statistics for rural areas for crimes known to the police and advises against the change.

Matters Discussed (4)	40
-----------------------	----

Present procedures in collecting data for the Uniform Crime Reports versus sampling procedure. The consensus of the Committee is in favor of the present procedure.

Matters Discussed (5)	41
-----------------------	----

Arson. The Committee feels that no change is indicated with reference to the present handling of arson.

Matters Discussed (6)	43
-----------------------	----

The Committee did not consider it necessary to make any specific recommendations with regard to the collection and reporting of data on offenders in the juvenile age bracket, believing that the FBI's entering into the juvenile field on a more intensive and extended basis would take the Uniform Crime Reporting Program outside of its originally planned and presently observed scope, which is a policy matter for decision by the FBI itself.

(End of Consultant Committee Report)

Data for 1957 from Police Reports

Explanation

This section was compiled from police reports before the receipt of the report of the Consultant Committee which is printed in the preceding pages and, therefore, does not contain any of the changes recommended by the Committee.

Crime data received under this program for the calendar year 1957, but not included in the 1957 Uniform Crime Reports, are presented here. This completes the presentation of 1957 data for the purpose of preserving continuity and is in line with recommendation No. 2 of the Consultant Committee on Uniform Crime Reporting. The semi-annual issue of Uniform Crime Reports has been discontinued, and hereafter one Uniform Crime Reports each year will be available for distribution in the early fall and will include all data for the previous calendar year heretofore included in the annual and semiannual issues.

Offenses Cleared and Persons Arrested, 1957

Table 1 reflects the ratio of offenses cleared by arrest and persons charged per each 100 offenses known, on the average, based on information voluntarily submitted by 1,885 cities representing about 74 percent of the population residing in cities in this country. The data in table 1 are limited to eight categories and are arranged with cities grouped by size. Table 2 reflects for the same 1,885 cities arranged by geographical divisions, the number of offenses known, the number of offenses cleared by arrest, and the percentage of offenses cleared by arrest.

Reports of 198 cities over 25,000 are summarized in table 3 to show for 8 categories the number of offenses known, the number of offenses cleared by arrest, the number of persons charged and the number and percentage of persons found guilty. For the other crime categories, for which offenses known information is not collected, table 4 reflects for the 198 cities used in table 3, the number of persons charged and the number and percentage of such persons found guilty.

Table 1.—Offenses Known, Cleared by Arrest, and Persons Charged (Held for Prosecution), 1957, by Population Groups, Number per 100 Known Offenses

Population group; number of cities and percentage of city population represented within each group	Criminal homicide		Rape	Robbery	Aggravated assault	Burglary—breaking or entering	Larceny— theft	Auto theft
	Murder, nonnegligent manslaughter	Manslaughter by negligence						
TOTAL, GROUPS I-VI								
1,885 cities; 74 percent:								
Offenses known.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Offenses cleared by arrest.....	91.5	90.9	89.9	43.4	77.6	29.6	30.1	30.1
Persons charged.....	90.7	78.3	78.5	43.3	66.3	31.0	15.4	23.3
GROUP I								
35 cities over 250,000; 88 percent:								
Offenses known.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Offenses cleared by arrest.....	90.1	91.2	79.7	42.9	75.9	29.6	22.2	28.2
Persons charged.....	89.7	77.1	71.3	40.0	64.9	17.8	15.3	20.0
4 cities over 1,000,000; 89 percent:								
Offenses known.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Offenses cleared by arrest.....	89.1	94.3	80.7	45.7	74.9	31.0	23.6	31.6
Persons charged.....	90.2	113.8	71.9	40.1	65.0	15.4	12.8	23.7
6 cities, 750,000 to 1,000,000; 100 percent:								
Offenses known.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Offenses cleared by arrest.....	90.3	90.7	80.4	36.3	77.7	25.6	18.9	17.7
Persons charged.....	82.4	106.2	62.8	39.0	59.7	23.5	16.9	16.9
6 cities, 500,000 to 750,000; 83 percent:								
Offenses known.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Offenses cleared by arrest.....	93.0	88.8	87.6	46.7	81.9	27.6	25.1	21.1
Persons charged.....	90.4	37.1	89.8	59.8	73.5	24.5	25.0	21.6
19 cities, 250,000 to 500,000; 83 percent:								
Offenses known.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Offenses cleared by arrest.....	89.9	90.0	72.0	41.3	75.1	30.2	21.8	36.8
Persons charged.....	94.3	50.4	68.2	34.5	71.7	15.7	14.0	18.4
GROUP II								
50 cities, 100,000 to 250,000; 75 percent:								
Offenses known.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Offenses cleared by arrest.....	93.8	92.0	79.1	39.9	71.3	27.6	16.9	29.7
Persons charged.....	88.9	76.6	75.8	45.9	59.8	20.5	14.1	23.1
GROUP III								
104 cities, 50,000 to 100,000; 80 percent:								
Offenses known.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Offenses cleared by arrest.....	95.0	82.9	83.6	40.8	81.3	28.4	17.0	28.5
Persons charged.....	94.7	67.3	91.1	50.9	70.8	21.9	15.0	22.9
GROUP IV								
198 cities, 25,000 to 50,000; 72 percent:								
Offenses known.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Offenses cleared by arrest.....	94.7	84.2	86.0	44.5	88.3	29.8	18.5	30.1
Persons charged.....	94.7	77.0	89.9	60.1	90.5	25.0	15.1	29.1
GROUP V								
548 cities, 10,000 to 25,000; 68 percent:								
Offenses known.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Offenses cleared by arrest.....	94.8	100.0	84.8	42.1	87.1	31.8	18.9	40.5
Persons charged.....	91.9	108.5	91.7	58.3	90.5	27.2	15.7	39.7
GROUP VI								
950 cities under 10,000; 39 percent:								
Offenses known.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Offenses cleared by arrest.....	85.0	95.7	86.9	48.4	80.5	33.8	23.8	46.0
Persons charged.....	90.7	94.6	95.0	58.9	94.6	32.5	19.2	46.0

Table 2.—Number of Offenses Known, Number and Percentage Cleared by Arrest, 1957, by Geographic Divisions

Geographic division; number of cities and percentage of city population represented within each division	Criminal homicide		Rape	Robbery	Aggravated assault	Burglary—breaking or entering	Larceny—steal	Auto theft
	Murder, non-negligent manslaughter	Manslaughter by negligence						
TOTAL, ALL DIVISIONS								
1,885 cities; 74 percent:								
Number of offenses known.....	3,336	2,281	9,763	42,529	58,608	330,117	867,514	168,239
Number cleared by arrest.....	3,054	2,057	7,896	18,129	45,506	94,848	174,288	50,715
Percentage cleared by arrest.....	91.5	90.2	80.9	42.6	77.6	29.6	20.1	30.1
New England States; 151 cities; 78 percent:								
Number of offenses known.....	86	168	421	1,160	1,258	17,612	47,167	12,884
Number cleared by arrest.....	73	138	389	505	1,032	5,143	8,964	3,381
Percentage cleared by arrest.....	84.9	82.1	92.4	43.5	82.0	29.2	19.0	26.2
Middle Atlantic States; 418 cities; 83 percent:								
Number of offenses known.....	625	498	3,179	9,519	16,945	74,727	157,875	33,093
Number cleared by arrest.....	554	475	2,642	4,604	12,802	21,814	31,755	11,567
Percentage cleared by arrest.....	88.6	97.3	83.1	48.4	75.6	29.2	20.1	35.0
East North Central States; 460 cities; 82 percent:								
Number of offenses known.....	808	474	2,190	14,257	12,456	65,015	200,899	34,494
Number cleared by arrest.....	724	413	1,734	5,867	9,585	20,123	41,396	11,744
Percentage cleared by arrest.....	89.6	87.1	79.2	41.2	77.0	31.0	20.6	34.0
West North Central States; 202 cities; 80 percent:								
Number of offenses known.....	226	171	718	3,726	3,288	25,658	79,992	12,819
Number cleared by arrest.....	206	154	561	1,351	2,268	7,278	15,103	4,007
Percentage cleared by arrest.....	91.2	90.1	78.1	36.3	69.0	28.4	18.9	31.3
South Atlantic States; 174 cities; 68 percent:								
Number of offenses known.....	672	305	954	3,993	13,744	36,414	91,496	17,829
Number cleared by arrest.....	649	292	782	1,837	11,762	11,193	22,596	4,783
Percentage cleared by arrest.....	96.6	95.7	82.0	46.0	85.6	30.7	24.7	26.8
East South Central States; 60 cities; 39 percent:								
Number of offenses known.....	174	56	123	713	1,978	8,788	18,251	5,660
Number cleared by arrest.....	168	49	98	272	1,438	2,140	3,500	1,146
Percentage cleared by arrest.....	96.6	87.5	79.7	38.1	72.7	24.4	19.2	20.2
West South Central States; 100 cities; 58 percent:								
Number of offenses known.....	445	262	667	2,636	4,210	33,260	78,906	17,478
Number cleared by arrest.....	406	246	574	1,255	3,394	11,841	20,415	5,337
Percentage cleared by arrest.....	91.2	93.9	86.1	47.6	80.6	35.6	25.9	30.5
Mountain States; 100 cities; 75 percent:								
Number of offenses known.....	86	59	336	1,590	1,100	14,184	48,567	8,155
Number cleared by arrest.....	81	56	275	637	810	3,972	8,334	2,471
Percentage cleared by arrest.....	94.2	94.9	81.8	40.1	73.6	28.0	17.2	30.3
Pacific States; 220 cities; 65 percent:								
Number of offenses known.....	214	298	1,175	4,935	3,629	44,459	144,361	25,827
Number cleared by arrest.....	193	234	841	1,801	2,415	11,344	22,185	6,279
Percentage cleared by arrest.....	90.2	78.5	71.6	36.5	66.5	25.5	15.4	24.3

¹ Includes the District of Columbia.

Table 3.—Offenses Known, Cleared by Arrest, and Number of Persons Found Guilty, 1957; 198 Cities Over 25,000 in Population Representing 54 Percent of the City Population for Those Cities Over 25,000

Offense	Number of offenses		Number of persons				Percent age found guilty
	Known to the police	Cleared by arrest	Charged (held for prosecu- tion)	Found guilty			
				Total guilty	Offense charged	Lesser offense	
TOTAL	757,535	211,056	155,299	97,015	83,354	13,661	62.5
Criminal homicide:							
(a) Murder and nonnegli- gent manslaughter...	1,787	1,628	1,654	1,118	821	297	67.6
(b) Manslaughter by neg- ligence.....	1,170	1,043	909	283	221	62	31.1
Rape.....	6,410	5,138	4,660	2,401	1,831	570	51.5
Robbery.....	28,994	12,573	12,150	7,571	6,034	1,537	62.3
Aggravated assault.....	37,690	29,194	24,525	10,116	7,081	3,035	41.2
Burglary—breaking or enter- ing.....	169,094	49,086	30,978	20,623	17,071	3,552	66.6
Larceny—steal (except auto theft).....	426,357	85,919	60,638	42,572	39,406	3,166	70.2
Auto theft.....	86,033	26,475	19,785	12,331	10,899	1,442	62.3

Table 4.—Number of Persons Charged (Held for Prosecution) and Number Found Guilty, 1957; 198 Cities Over 25,000 in Population Representing 54 Percent of the City Population for Those Cities Over 25,000

Offense	Number of persons charged (held for prosecution)				Percent- age found guilty
	TOTAL CHARGED	Found guilty			
		TOTAL GUILTY	Offense charged	Lesser offense	
TOTAL.....	14,783,400	10,985,099	10,938,376	46,723	74.3
Other assaults.....	52,001	26,869	25,951	918	51.7
Forgery and counterfeiting.....	4,854	3,954	3,285	669	81.5
Embezzlement and fraud.....	12,319	7,620	6,900	720	61.9
Stolen property; buying, receiving, etc.....	3,274	1,565	1,429	136	47.8
Weapons; carrying, possessing, etc.....	12,353	7,874	7,514	360	63.7
Sex offenses (including prostitution and com- mercialized vice).....	34,246	22,676	21,453	1,223	66.2
Offenses against family and children.....	16,145	9,672	9,429	243	59.9
Narcotic drug laws.....	13,147	9,453	9,082	371	71.9
Liquor laws.....	24,813	16,277	16,158	119	65.6
Drunkenness; disorderly conduct; vagrancy..	801,827	578,336	577,116	1,220	72.1
Gambling.....	81,712	37,116	37,031	85	45.4
Driving while intoxicated.....	53,463	42,642	38,723	3,919	79.8
Traffic and motor vehicle laws.....	13,463,187	10,077,389	10,042,162	35,227	74.9
All other offenses.....	210,059	143,656	142,143	1,513	68.4

g

nd

5

6

1

5

3

2

6

2

3

er

ig

at-

nd

r

4.3

1.7

1.5

1.9

7.8

3.7

6.2

9.9

1.9

5.6

2.1

5.4

9.8

4.9

8.4

1871-1872

1873-1874

